

H. Hutchinson (J.) *4224.2 42*
3

A
DEFENCE

OF
Mr. HUTCHINSON'S PLAN:

Being an
ANSWER

TO THE
Modest Apology, &c.

In a LETTER to the COUNTRY-CLERGYMAN

By Julius Bate M.A.
"Speak to us smooth Things; prophesy Deceits."

Isaiah 30. 10.

LONDON:

Printed for JAMES HODGES, at the Looking-
Glass, over against St. Magnus's Church, London-
Bridge: And M. COOPER, at the Globe in Pater-
Noster-Row, 1748.

[Price One Shilling and Six-pence.]

A
DEFENCE
 OF
 Mr. HUTCHINSON'S PLAN:
 Being an
ANSWER
 TO THE

Model
 &c.



In a LETTER to the COUNTRY-CLERGYMAN

Spoken to in London, &c. &c.

L O N D O N :

Printed for JAMES HODGES, at the leading-
 Glass, over against St. John's Church, London.
 By Mr. AND M. COOPER, at the Office in Patern-
 1748.

[Price One Shilling and Sixpence]

[1]

A N

ANSWER, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

I Thank you for the Sight of the *Modest Apology*, which I suppose you sent me, because you knew I was fond of Mr. *Hutchinson's* Writings ; and had been induced by them to study the *Hebrew* Language itself. The surprizing Discoveries in Natural Philosophy, Hieroglyphicks, the History and Mythology of the Antients, and the new Scene *H.* has opened in the general Design of the *Old Testament*, having given me great Satisfaction, made me endeavour to persuade you to entertain and improve yourself with

A reading

reading my favourite Author. Tho' you have often confessed, in general, that great Part of the *Old T.* is not made *Common Sense* of in any Translation we have, or explained by any Commentator, yet you declined from your Age and Situation, the entering into a new Study, being yourself fully satisfied of the Truth, and, you hoped, sufficiently instructed in the Nature of the Christian Religion, and the Evidence it was to stand on; and did not doubt but the same Providence of God that had hitherto preserved it, would still do so, notwithstanding the united Endeavours of Atheists, Clarkists, &c. The *odious* Insinuation, that if *H.* had advanced any thing *new* of *real* Consequence, and made any *important* Discoveries, that then the *Clergy* had been *negligent*, at least *were ignorant of their own Profession*, did not ruffle your candid Mind, as being an Argument addressed to the *Passions* only. But the *Offence* that would be taken at it, by some you used to tell me, would create a pretty *strong underhand* Opposition, right or wrong; as well as furnish an Handle to little Minds to justify ^{their} *your* Neglect of his Writings, and to prejudice others against them, on the same Account.

THE *Blounts*, *Tindals*, *Tolands*, and such Leviathans had made Sport with the Word
of

of God, and ridiculed the Scriptures, and the ^{Scriptures} ~~sacred~~ Doctrines, so far that you plainly saw the Majority were on their Side, but it was their Business to see to those Things who were at the Head of Affairs; and situated in populous Places where those were numerous, to whom Church Authority, and the *Fathers*, were but Sport and Diversion; and whom nothing but *Reason* and *Argument* would satisfy; telling them, that this or that Explication was the *avowed Tenet of the Jewish Church*, which perhaps was not true, and if it were, had no Authority in it, being a direct Contradiction to the Principles of the Reformation, which propose *the Bible, the Bible* for the Religion of Protestants, only increased their Sport, and served to raise the louder Laugh.

How often has the *Building of Babel*, e. g. and *the Confusion of Tongues*, been Diversion to them and Confusion of Face to us! Whether we consider the Design of *the Rebuilding*, or the Miracle *supposed* to be wrought, to prevent the carrying that Design into Execution; how silly and ridiculous, how beyond Imagination, childish, is a Thought of building up to Heaven—*a Tower whose Top may reach to Heaven!* They had Sense and Wit enough to *invent* the Rules of Architecture with *Tools* and

Materials for building, and actually did raise an Edifice that outlasted any thing of that Kind since, except a Pyramid or two in *Ægypt*, and yet did'nt know they could not build to the Moon, and thence step into Heaven. And what were they to do when they had got there? Dethrone the Almighty, and *take Heaven by Violence*; one would think so! And God himself is supposed to know no better, but that they might get to Heaven this Way, and he lose his Colony he had saved from the Deluge to replant the Earth (as expressed, *to be scattered abroad upon the Face of the Earth*) and so comes down, and works a Miracle to prevent it; a Miracle of a most surprising and extraordinary Nature, and which includes a thousand Miracles in it. This is making Idiots of the Projectors on the one Hand, and Men of a fine Genius and prodigious Imagination on the other. But how soon must they have found their Folly, and the Impossibility of getting even to the Clouds, have convinced them, they were not in the right Road to Heaven; and is it not setting the *Divine Wisdom* upon the same Level with that of these Idiots to suppose him jealous of their Project, and to come down to confound it by setting them gabbling and babbling at one another? The best

best Way would have been to have confined them in their Tower as *Madmen*, or whipt them as Children. Besides there was *no Confusion of Languages* here; or above *one Language* in the World for many, many Years after this; That has been proved by Friends and Foes. I know no Piece of Folly that comes up to that of this Story, but the contending for the Authority of these *blind Guides*, who have led us into this Labyrinth of Nonsense: When the whole has been made Sense and Truth of, and that by fair Constructions, supported by Authorities out of sacred Scripture. But the *Rabbies* are call'd *the Heads of a Church*, and if sacred Scripture cannot be explained by *the Heads of the Church*, let it—

THE setting ~~up~~ the Angels as Centinels round an Apple Tree in Paradise, and making our first Parents, a Couple of Playthings for the Creator in his Pleasure-Garden, and then turning them out of it in a Pet for stealing an Apple; (for which beautiful Account of Things, we are obliged to the *avowed Tenets* of the Apostate *Jews*, called by their Friend in his *Apology*, *the Jew-Church*, and coupled with the Primitive Christian Church, scarce comes up to the Folly and Stupidity of the other, or represent the Wisdom of God in a more disadvantageous View;

View ; and if Mr. *Hutchinson* had not dispelled those Clouds of Darkneſs which the *Apoſtates* enveloped theſe great Tranſactions in, I ſhould have trembled to have made ſo free with them, but have left them, as what I did not underſtand, as it is plain, the Translators, miſguided by the *Jewiſh Doctors*, did not.

WE have talked over the firſt Chapter of *Genesis*; you have endeavoured to make Senſe of the firſt Word of the Bible ; I have aſked you, *In the Beginning of what*, God created?—*In the Beginning of the World*, God created the World! you did not like this. *In the Beginning of Time*, God created the World, ſounded better to your Ears; but as Time began with the World, and is only the Meaſure of its Duration ; to ſay, *The World was created in the Beginning of Time*, or that, *Things were created in the Beginning of Things*, is, as if an Hiſtorian was by Way of Exordium to tell us,—*In the Beginning of his Life*, was born the great Man, *whoſe Life*, &c. Conſult your Friend the *Apologiſt* on this Head ; aſk him the Queſtion I have put to you, and let him inform you, if he can, *where* Mr. *Hutchinson* translates it *in the Summit*! would not the Place bear mentioning ? Mr. *Hutchinson*, in *Hebrew Writings Perfect*, tells us, and
cites

cites Authorities, that ראשית is *Chief*. of that which the Context speaks of: He had proved at large, that when *Moses* wrote, the far greater Part of the World had set up the *Fluid of the Air* for אלהים; worshiped and sacrificed to it, and the three Conditions it subsists on, and acts by; so *Moses* begins his History of the Creation and Formation of their *Aleim*; or his Description of the *real Powers* in the Air, with saying, the *Aleim of the chief Essence* created all Things; and *inter al.* their *Aleim* which were the Heavens; which is an inferior and secondary Substance. If he had not liked this, he should have confuted it, and not fathered a Piece of Nonsense of I do not know whose upon him: I wish we may find this the only Occasion of taxing your Friend's Hastiness or Insincerity, or both, in a *Willingness* to carp, without knowing why.

BUT to go on: The first Word is not *Sense*, as translated by the *Jewish* and *Christian* Churches, how many Objections have been raised, and by whom answered, on *Moses's* making *Light* subsist three Days before the *Sun*; on his placing a Body of Waters above the Firmament; placing *Sun*, *Moon* and *Stars* in the Firmament; making the *Moon* a *great Light*; the *Stars* to receive

receive their Light from the Sun, &c. how puzzled have Friends been to find out the Windows ^{of Heaven} and what Diverſion has it been to the Enemy? Theſe Windows were opened for Waters to come through them to drown the Earth at the Flood; according to *Mofes*, as now underſtood and tranſlated, thoſe Waters were *above* the Firmament, *below* or *within* which, he has *really* placed the Stars: Might not the learned *Jenkins* (whom I much reſpect and eſteem) or your good Friend, have found this *one Inſtance more*, of ſomething not conſiſtent with the preſent Notions of Philoſophy? I think they tell us that a Cannon Ball, at the Rate it moves when firſt ſhot, would be *fifty thouſand Years* a getting to the neareſt fixt Star; what a Rate then muſt theſe Waters travel at to get beyond the furthermoſt of them all in a Day's Time. They might come tumbling down perhaps a little faſter than they got up the Hill; but muſt have made a pretty deal of Haſte to perform ſo long a Journey in ſo little a Time either Way; the common Nonſenſe of *Mofes's Writing ad Captum Vulgi*, or according to *Appearance*, will not do here, no ſuch Waters appear above the Firmament. If you make theſe Waters to be the Clouds, then he talks directly againſt
Appear-

Appearance; every Child sees they are not *above* the Firmament, and but a very little Way *within* it: The naked Eye tells us, they are far below the Moon, much more below the Stars. And though every Coffee-House in Town, and within ten Miles of it, sounds all Day long with the Nonsense, &c. of the *Mosaic* Account; and every Bookseller's Shop, almost in *London*, swarms with Books, new and old, to ridicule it, and who have *demonstrated* these and many other Things, to be contrary not only to the stated Laws of Nature, but of Probability and common Sense also, yet your Friend knows nothing of the Matter, it is an *over-liberal injudicious Concession to the Enemy*, learned Men have shewn this supposed *Repugnancy* to be *imaginary and groundless*; and would but such forward Fellows as *H.* and the Editors, but be easy, and not put Things into the Heads of the Enemy, all would be well; but it is their Clamours has raised the Devil; we are contented to be the Jest of Unbelievers, but must we be made so of Christians too, unless we begin our A. B. C. again; no, no, we will take care and stop their Republication of such *insolent Books*; so seems their *Apologist* to reason, coupling himself with his *Betters*, without any Leave or Authority

B

rity from them, and making the superior Clergy, to whom *H.* always paid the greatest Respect, Parties in his petty Cavils; and though *H.* may have expressed himself with some Warmth, having his Eye upon one or two eminent Clergymen *then* living, whom he looked on as backward Friends, in which he did no more, nor indeed so much, as many of the superior Clergy did by themselves, yet no Man living ever paid a greater Deference to the Order, or perhaps received more *personal Respect* from some of the highest of the Order; I speak this upon certain Knowledge, that he did; and it is *little and mean*, to harangue upon such Expressions, and *insolent* to pretend to *apologize* for the *superior Clergy*, and defend them from a Charge no ways aimed at them. The *Editors*, by their *Advertisement*, seem to have applied themselves to one or more Persons *eminent in the Eye of the World*, on Account of their Learning, and Station in the Church, for their Opinion of *Mr. Hutchinson's Writings*, and if they did it with as much Modesty and Deference in *private*, as they have done in *publick*, the contrary of which is not to be *presumed* upon Surmise only, I trust, no impartial Person will judge they have demeaned themselves amiss, but

but that is an Affair I know nothing of, so leave it to themselves; what is before the Publick we may all judge of, and that and what follows in the *Apology* I shall now come to, there being some Particulars in your Friend's Performance which deserve a Consideration, and which you will indulge me in speaking freely upon, and though I cannot persuade you to feed yourself or Congregation with Bread made of *Hebrew* Roots; yet you must bear with me while I give you my Reasons why I continue to eat it myself, notwithstanding what your Friend has said against it. His *Rabbinical* Roots are the Apples of *Sodom*, the *Hebrew* are the Seed, the Word of God.

YOUR Friend has made an unlucky Choice of a Text by way of Motto, which is a Reflection upon all that follows, *David*, (1 *Sam.* 17.) has a divine Impulse upon his Mind to fight the great Enemy of the People of God, whom he had just heard defying their God and them; declares his Resolution to do so in publick. This is carried to *Saul*, who doubtless must think the Hand of God was in it; for a *Boy* to undertake with so much Confidence of Success, what his mighty Men all trembled at, and the *Prediction* of one or two great

Enemies to fall by *David's* Hands, in the miraculous Delivery of a *Lion* and a *Bear* into them by Almighty God, in that Age of Wonders, which *David* related as the Ground of his Confidence, naturally awakened *Saul's* Attention, and he cloathed the ~~inspiring~~ Hero in his own Armour; *David* tries to make use of them, but being unacquainted with the Weapons of War, puts them off, and resolves to leave the Event to a Miracle, *I cannot go with those*, says *David*, for *I have not proved them*; so saith your Friend, with Regard to Mr. *H's* Writings. The Parallel to *proving* or *trying* the Armour in *David*, is reading and examining *H's* Arguments, or what is the Parallel? It is in truth a very modest Answer then. "I have not examined *H*. so I declare
 " he is not in the right; his Arguments
 " like *Saul's* Sword and Helmet are not fit
 " for me to fight the Enemy with, which
 " I declare, because *I do not know what*
 " they are." *I have not proved them*: Why did *I declare against them* then? What hindered I from examining them first? Am I so prudent to declare to the World that I reject them, because *I have not proved* (tried or examined) *them*! modest this truly! but perhaps I am assured by something within,

as *David* was, that God will miraculously support me, and I shall prevail without the Weapons of the King of *Israel*, against his Enemy. *Maële Virtute, Go and prosper, for the Lord shall deliver him into thine Hand.*

LEAVING the *Editors* to ~~thank~~ your Friend for his Compliments to them, I might likewise leave what he has said about their *Advertisement* to them also, but the *Contradiction* in what he says is so glaring, that I don't point it out to you, as if you had not seen it, but to shew you that your Friend is not so well pleased with them, as his seeming Complaisance would make you think: Anger stifled within clouded his Understanding, or he must have seen it himself. They p. 5. (the Editors) confess that it has been insinuated to them, "by Persons eminent for their Learning and Station in the Church, that they had Objections which would entirely overthrow Mr. H's. whole Plan." Was it not their Duty then—to have paid so small a Compliment to their Judgment, as to take some publick Notice, that these Objections had been made? And the Advertisers in my Judgment have overshot the Mark, in owning that
they

they were informed such material Objections had been made—since they do not offer at the least Shadow of a Reply; and so leave the Reader to conclude, that the Objections which were made, are unanswerable. p. 6. l. 29. I can easily conceive therefore that these eminent Persons the Objectors might not care to acquaint the Advertisers with their Objections, &c.

HERE is back Stroke and fore Stroke with a Vengeance; the Objectors had good Reasons not to acquaint the Advertisers with their Objections in publick or private, but the Editors are much to blame in not answering, or so much as offering at the least Shadow of a Reply to those Objections, which they were never acquainted with; and which they were not acquainted with, because they did not apply for them properly and at a seasonable Hour, and for other weighty Reasons which you may read, p. 6, 7. The Editors have overshot themselves in owning such Objections were made, which they do own, because they declare *the Objections were not made to them, or ever came to their Knowledge; They say, "some eminent Persons have thought fit to insinuate as if they had Objections, &c."* and then, "with all proper Submission
" and

“ and Deference to those great Men, hum-
 “ bly request that they will be pleased to
 “ publish their Objections, and if upon
 “ Examination, they shall really be of *that*
 “ Force as to admit of no *fair* and *full* An-
 “ swer, they will desist from their De-
 “ sign.” This is owning that *they were*
informed, such material Objections had been
 made, and giving the World Room to
 think the Objections are *unanswerable*, be-
 cause the *Editors* have not attempted the
 Shadow of a Reply. They are not so cun-
 ning as the *Apologist* to answer Arguments
 they have never seen ; and too modest to do
 by those eminent Persons, as he has by Mr.
H, to undertake a Confutation of what
 they wrote before they *have seen* it.
 Your Friend blames the *Editors* both for
 not *getting*, and not *answering* the Ob-
 jections, and puts the Case himself,

*If it be said that the Advertisers were not
 favoured by those learned Persons with the
 Substance and Purport of their Objections,*

WHY should he suppose it *to be said*
so, when he has asserted the *Objections were*
made, and blamed the *Editors* for want of
 Deference to the Judgment of those great
 Persons, so far as not to attempt the Shadow
 of a Reply ! and, *if it may be said*, the
Editors were not favoured with those Ob-
 jections,

jections, which his *Apology for the great Persons* not favouring them with them, does suppose, then where is his Modesty in taxing the Editors with want of Deference and Respect to *the great Persons*, and with betraying their own Undertaking to the Censure of the World, in giving it Room, to think by their Silence, there were *unanswerable Objections* made, which they *could not*, because they *did not* answer. What Figure am I to call this, of making a Man say, *yes*, because he says *no*; and what is it makes your Friend talk backward and forward in this Manner; and is it want of Charity or Sense that makes him condemn the Editors for not answering or attempting to answer Objections, they and he too, confess they have never seen; and to obtain a Sight of which the Advertisement was published. What follows about the Editors is in the Stamp with what we have been a considering, and let them defend themselves, I shall pass on to the Objections to the *Hutchinsonian Plan*.

YOUR Friend takes up p. 9, 10, with Citations out of the *Proposals* about the Philosophy of the Scriptures, and Objections from thence against the Veracity of the Scriptures, and asks, *What established Laws of Nature they are to which the Scripture*

as they are translated, are apparently repugnant. Had he looked where the *Proposals* refer him, he might easily have informed himself; but the *Proposals* point out one Instance, when the Scriptures ascribe Motion to the Sun, which your Friend cites and appeals to every reasonable and unprejudiced natural Philosopher, whether such Expressions as the Sun's rising and setting, running from one End of Heaven to the other, beating on the Head of Jonas, &c. may not fairly be reconciled to the established Laws of Nature. The Sun is fixed, and moves not from its Place, this is an established Law of Nature; now what does he mean by reconciling an Expression that says, the Sun moves, to a Law that hath fixed it? if he can make moving and standing still be the same thing, as he did yes and no just now, he may reconcile these Contrarieties; in the mean Time, since we are to poll for it, I leave it to every Person who has common Sense, whether moving and standing still are not Contraries; and as to these Expressions being an insuperable Objection to the Philosophy of the Scriptures, I apprehend they are directly contrary to true Philosophy, and that if Scripture (as according to your Friend, and the Translations, it does) do assert the Sun moves, it asserts what is

C

false

false in Fact, and so asserts what is not true Philosophy ; and what other Objection can there be against the Philosophy of Scripture, than that it is false ? and is it not an *insuperable Objection* to a Thing's being true, that it is false ? Your Friend don't seem to take the Meaning of his own Words ; it may admit of a Dispute whether those Expressions which ascribe Motion to the Sun may prejudice the Infallibility and Authority of Scripture, because it *may be said*, that the Scriptures did not intend to assert any thing *pro* or *con* the Question of the Sun's Motion, but only spoke after the common Phrase ; but to say such Expressions are reconcileable to the Laws of Nature, which say the very reverse, shews the Man did not know what he was talking about. But the Fact is quite otherwise ; Mankind were much better Philosophers when the Scriptures were wrote than now ; and the Scriptures do affirm the Earth moves, in many Places, and by a Variety of Expressions, and it would have been agreeable to the Rules in Disputation, if your Friend would first have *heard* before he had answered *H*.

His next Objection is a meer Cavil. *The Proposals* urge, that our Translators by the marginal Reading do confess, that many Words, which they have given a
wrong

wrong Turn to in the Text, would bear another Sense more conform to true Philosophy, therefore the Editors *confess too much*, says the Apologist, *for if the marginal Reading could not be reconciled to their then present Notions, and if the Translators have given a two-fold Version of many Hebrew Words, Why should the wrong Version be allowed to stand in the Way, and to be an insuperable Objection to the Authority of the Scriptures, and the right be excluded from being a Proof of their Authority?*

CANNOT your Friend see that this *two-fold Version* is urged as a Proof of the Authority of the Scriptures in Matters of Philosophy, since the Translators have given a better Sense to many Words in the *Margin* than in the *Text*, being, biassed by the then false prevailing Notions of Philosophy! but then the *Many*, they have given a double *Version* to, bears but a small Proportion to the Numbers that want to be better understood: *H.* takes in those the Translators durst not put into the Text, and corrects the rest: The two-fold Version cannot be true; one or the other is false.

YOUR Friend mistakes the Point in Dispute, *the Infalibility* of Scripture, depends not on any Translation, but its Credit with Enemies will depend on the Construction,

Infalibility

Construction

the Clergy or Christians in General put upon it, no Infidel can ever be persuaded to believe that that is Scripture, or the infallible Word of God, which they confess they cannot reconcile to Truth or make Sense of. It may be the Word of God, but unless we make *Sense* and *Truth* of it, and that by fair *Construction*, we can't urge it as such; and it is Scripture no further to us than we can prove its Meaning, and clear that Meaning from the Objections of the Adversary.

BUT the *main Error* is still behind; and we have it, p. 11. at Top; that *the Authority of Scripture is made dependant to the Meaning of the Editors upon the present prevailing System of natural Philosophy.*

I told you before, your Friend was fighting without knowing with whom, or against what; this comes of undertaking to confute what he has Leave *never* to read, nothing less than establishing the present, or *Newtonian* System of Philosophy was in *H's* Mind, or, as far as I can judge, in the Intention of the Editors; much less making Scripture subservient to that Philosophy, or to any; but to make all Philosophy depend on the Scriptures. A Vacuum and occult Qualities, Virtues issuing out of solid Orbs, and the other Dreams of the modern Philo-

Philosophy, are as far from the Sense of Scripture, as construed by *H.* as the Motion of the Sun is. The Motion of the Earth, was not a *Newtonian* Discovery; nor is any *Hypothesis*, but was demonstrated long before Sir *Isaac Newton* had the Presumption to call himself a Philosopher. No Man ever made any thing more ridiculous than *H.* has shewn the *Newtonian* or present System of Philosophy to be; but your Friend hath not read *H.* had he known what the present System of Philosophy is, he could not but have seen, that what the *Proposals* transcribe from *H.* and from a *Letter to a Bishop*, which is extracted out of *H.*'s *second Part of Moses's Principia*, is diametrically opposite to every Article of the *Newtonian* Philosophy.

YOUR Friend will not say, he tells you, that because the Scriptures are seemingly repugnant even to the *Newtonian* Philosophy, that therefore the Holy Penmen were mistaken in natural Things, because he cannot be so well assured that Sir *Isaac Newton's* *Isaac* System is true, as he is that the Philosophy of Scripture, be that what it may, is the Word of God.

I hope he is better assured that the Scriptures are the Word of God, than he is, that the *Newtonian* System is true. But suppose

suppose he has *demonstrated* to himself, *e. g.* that the Earth moves, and that there is a *Vacuum*; and he sees Scripture, as far as he knows, assert the Motion of the Sun and a *Plenum*, can he then be as sure, *that this Philosophy is* (he should not have said, *the Word*, but the Sense of) *the Word of God*? Suppose so, will he set the Assertions of Scripture against such Demonstrations? to which will he give the Preference? *Will he say the Holy Penmen were not mistaken in natural Things*? If he do so, Infidels will not; they will laugh, and put him on disproving their Demonstrations; or else he must give up the Authority of Scripture in those Points, and unsay what he says, above of the holy Penmen being mistaken in natural Things.

To answer the Questions in p. 12, 13, I must transcribe two or three Volumes of *H's*. If he will read, I trust he will have satisfactory Answers to all Queries, Scruples, and Doubts, and that his Fears of the Abuse of Scripture by *imaginary Misrepresentations* will vanish; if he wont *prove those Arms*, *H.* has furnished us with, he must let it alone. He asks what *Test* and *Criterion* is prescribed to guard against the Sallies of a lively Imagination? Why the Uniformity of the whole; the Nature and Genius of the

the *Hebrew* Tongue, *cum multis aliis*, too long to transcribe here, and he may keep every Test he had of use to that Purpose before. If one Word have but *one* leading Idea throughout the Bible, which *H.* has shewn to be the Genius of the *Hebrew* Tongue, that is a strong Check upon the Sallies of Imagination; and will enable us to controul the roving, rambling Spirit of the Apostates, who have proved, *quid libet ex quolibet*; have made every Thing of any Thing, and any Thing of every Thing. If the Language be loose, vague and uncertain, the same Word signify ten different Things, and in many Places, the *direct reverse* of what it does in others, as those Wretches called *Rabbies*, and (in Spight of the Prophets, of Christ, of the Apostles History, and common Sense) dubbed with the Title of *the Church*, have taught us, then may not only *Imagination*, but *Judgment* likewise wander till they are weary, having no Bounds to confine them; But if the Reverse of this be the Case, *Certainty* and *Conviction* will be the Fruits of *Words* and *Rules* fixed, certain and clear: But the Misfortune is, a Christian has given us the latter, who has examined and made use of every Thing, writ upon the Scriptures that has come down to us; and the former we take

take upon the Authority of the Church of —Satan; a People wicked, malicious, ignorant, Enemies; who had not the Helps to understand the Language that we have. *Hebrew* had been a dead Language, eight or nine hundred Years, when they first began, as far as we know to the Contrary, to invent their Rules of Grammar, and Pointing. The LXX. is an indisputable Proof of what Skill their Fathers had so many hundreds of Years before, in the Scriptures: Though that Performance be of infinite Service, the Scriptures being so ordered by the all-seeing Eye; that they could not be translated without giving every Word of Consequence its true Sense in many Places; yet the Ignorance or Malice of those who made that Translation, during the Time that they were the Church of God, may easily teach us what we are to expect from those who came hundreds of Years afterwards when the Spirit of God had forsaken them, and Opposition to Christianity made them write, say and do any Thing.

Suppose, says your Friend, that it (Mr. H's Physico-Theology) were infallible, and not liable to Abuse, yet whom will an Argument grounded upon these Principles convince?

IF we can't convince Gain-sayers by Arguments that are *infallible*, *what Way* would be convince them by?—

— Not those certainly, who will not be persuaded by the more positive and literal Declarations of Scripture.

PHILOSOPHICAL and Hieroglyphical Arguments are as *positive* as what he calls, *literal* Declarations; and *Hieroglyphicks* were all the *Writing* Mankind had, till *Letters* were revealed by *Moses*; and the *literal* Declarations are in Words whose Ideas we must fetch in from Objects of Sense. The Soul is limited to receive its Information through the Organs of the Body, and Words being only Substitutes of the Ideas conveyed through those Organs; we must understand the Nature of Things before those Words can instruct us; and this is what St. Paul says, that the *invisible Things of God*, viz. his eternal Power and Godhead, are seen, being understood, by the Things that are made, so there is no understanding a *literal* Account till you have, by Philosophy, the Ideas of the Words. What those Things that are made are, which are to help us to understand and see the invisible Things of God, was the Intent and Drift of H's undertaking to point out from the Scriptures. If ^{his} natural Philosophy be true, ^{his} Theology will

D

will stand upon Demonstration ; but his
seems Physico-Theology. it seem is not true, for
first,

— PAGE 14, *The material Spirit is not the
 Type of the holy and immaterial Spirit.* It is
 argued in the *proposals*,* “ that our Lord,
 “ explains the Operations of the holy Spirit
 “ in the new Birth, by the Actions and
 “ Effects of his Type, the material Spi-
 “ rit,” *But this Argument proves too much,*
p. 38. says the *Apologist*, this Argument is not the
28. hundreth Part of the Evidence produced by
H. The *Proposals* are only a short Extract,
 detached from the Evidence and Illustration;
 but why does it prove too much?

*Because this will be a Reason why I should
 believe all other Things to be Types also of the
 holy Spirit to which our Saviour has compar-
 ed the same Operations, and in short to con-
 ceive every Similitude to be a Type, wherein
 natural Things are by him compared to the
 Mysteries of Religion.*

AGREED ; every Similitude is a Type,
 and the Mystery must hold true in that
 Respect in which it is compared to it, nor
 can we have any Description of a Mystery
 but by some Similitude ; Ideas are all na-
 tural ; and Mysteries spiritual. But,

*The secret and invisible Workings of the di-
 vine Spirit in the Propagation of the Gospel,
 are*

are at other Times compared to the ⁱⁿperceptible and speedy Growth of Vegetables; to a Grain of Mustard Seed, Matt. 13. 31, 32. to Corn sown in the Earth, which springs up and grows, we know not how. Does it not follow therefore on H's Principles, that the Grain of Mustard Seed, and all other Seeds likewise, were intended by Christ to be esteemed by us the Correspondent natural Types of the Holy Ghost.

Do you think, Sir, your Friend doth not know how to construe better? if he does not, I am sorry for him; and should wonder who set him up for an *Apologist*; if he be only playing with us, and knew better, I think it mightily out of Season. What is compared here to the Growth of Vegetables? not the Operation of the holy Spirit, but the *Spreading* of the Gospel; let him look at the Texts again; a Mustard-Seed, says our Lord though very small, soon becomes a very great Tree, and the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a Mustard-Seed; and from a small Beginning, like the other, shall quickly spread far and wide; and like a Seed grow continually in a Manner unperceived; our Lord says, it is the *Kingdom of Heaven* that he compares to the Growth of a Seed; and the Analogy shews in what Respect ~~A~~ Grain of Seed can't grow with-

out the *material Spirit*, nor the Seed of God without the Assistance and Influence of the holy Spirit; so that this Text, instead of being a Disproof, is another direct Proof of a Parallel drawn between the *material* and *immaterial Spirit*. The Gospel is the Seed; the Growth of the one, is the Propagation of the other; and it is *the Spirit* that gives the Increase in both Cases.)

So again, from *Eccles. 11. 5.* your Friend argues, "That the Works of God are compared to the Way or Motion of the Wind, and to the Growth of the Fœtus in the Womb; as *thou knowest not the Way of the Spirit or Wind, nor how the Bones do grow in the Womb of her that is with Child; even so thou knowest not the Works of God who maketh all*: Here is another correspondent natural Type—not confined to the third Person only in the God-head, but extended to them all,"

EXTENDED to them all, though not one of them is so much as hinted at in the Comparison; *thou knowest not*, says Solomon, *the Way of the Wind or Spirit, even so thou knowest not the Works of God*; as you are ignorant of the one, you are ignorant of the other, therefore, *the Works of God are compared to the Spirit, therefore to all the three Persons of the Trinity?* Does there want any

any Thing further to shew the extreme Futility of such Reasoning? Did not you know your Friend's Way of Writing, and had some private Reasons for thinking he was doing his best, I question whether you would not think the Editors had set up a Person to play booty.

THERE is the same jumble of Ideas in his Reasoning in the next Page, which I shall pass over.

Page 16. *St. Paul dissuades us from the intricate and laborious Enquiries of Philosophy.*—

YOUR Friend should have added, *and vain Deceit*, as it is in one Place, and *falsely so called*, in another; and then his Argument would prove just nothing; you must not study the *true* Philosophy because you must not study the *false*; for there has been a false Philosophy a long Time in the World. If the Editors Arguments prove too much; the *Apologist's* don't prove enough. The Book of Nature is only to be read in *Hebrew*, it is in the Bible.

BUT we are now, page 16. to consider *whether the Philosophical Argument made use of by H. in Support of the Doctrine of the Trinity be, conclusive and just.*

AND this Argument is to be answered from an Extract that has not so many Lines
in

in it as *H.* has Sheets upon the Subject; were we afraid, (*as it shews the Clergy have not hitherto understood their Trade*) to look at it in its full Proportion, to survey it round, and see what it could say for itself? However, naked as it stands, your Friend allows it an *ingenious Illustration*; and thinks it like that of some of the *Fathers*, who compare the first Person to the *Sun*, the second to a Ray of Light, the holy Spirit to the *Heat*; and they are called judicious, in not urging this as a direct Proof, but pertinent Illustration only: It had been more judicious not to have drawn a Comparison at all, that derogates so much from the *Co-equality* of the Persons; it makes the third Person but as an *Effect*; the Consequence of the Action of Light which *warms*; and the *Son*, either a Minute Part, or not all distinct from the *Father*: Had *H.* done so, *all had been well*; but an *Affectation of Singularity*.—Here lies the Core; *hinc illæ Lacrymæ*. If he be in the right, what have we been about, and what shall we appear in the Eyes of the World, for having so long neglected even to read him? what becomes of the *Fathers* in whose Shoes we stand? Wherever *self* stands above *Truth*, there *his Affectation of Singularity* that is, his leaving the old Road of Church Authority,

riety, this must be right, because it is the avowed Tenet of the Jewish and Christian Church, will be an insuperable Objection.

But what is advanced by the Proposals, on this same Philosophical Argument, and pronounced to be a sensible Demonstration, instead of being proved, is rather begged or assumed.

YOUR Friend is much in the Right of it; the Proposals do assume it: What else could they do? but they refer to where it is proved at large. Now for your Friend's Objection, which, if it will be well proved, would be to the Purpose indeed. Page 18. *If these Terms, (Fire, Light, Spirit) are used promiscuously of the Three divine Persons; then they can neither express by their Names, that they are Emblems; nor by their Conditions of what they are Emblems; this I allow, and let us see the Proof.*

Fire.—It is not the first, but the second Person, or Word, who is so called. The Places where this Appellation is originally given are, Deut. 4. 24. 9, 3. in the former of which, the God spoken of, is the Lord God, which made a Covenant with the Israelites:—But this Covenant was given by the Angel, Acts 7. 38.—i.e. God the Son, the second Person in the Trinity. In the latter it is said, the Lord thy God goeth over Jordan before thee,
a con-

a consuming Fire ; but the divine Person who conducted the Israelites into Canaan, was not the Father ; for he had peremptorily refused to go with them, *Exod. 33. 3*, and consigned them over to the Guidance and Protection of his Angel ; i. e. the Word or Son.

ONE Part of this Argument will help me to answer the other. It is asserted to be the Father who speaks, *Exod. 33. 1, 3*. and so is the same Person spoken of, *Deut. 4. 24*. which appeaas by comparing the Texts.—The Person who gave them the Law, is the same Person who refused, i. e. threatned not, to go with them, *Exod. 33*. for the Person or Persons, who gave them the Law, is the same who swore to their Fathers to give them the Land of Canaan, and to send his Angel before them ; *Exod. 20. 2*. *I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the Land of Ægypt, &c.* Continues his Discourse to *Ch. 23*. and 20. and then says, *Behold I send an Angel before thee to keep thee in the Way.*—My Name is in him. If then it be the Father who says, *Exod. 33*. *I will send an Angel before them* ; it is the Father who gave them the Law, because he who gave them the Law, promised to send the Angel ; and, since according to your Friend, he who gave them the Law, is he who brought them into Canaan, he
has

has himself furnished us with an Answer to his own Argument. He mistakes *Exod.* 33. 3. God only *threatens* not to go with them, on the Account of the *Calf* which Aaron made. God slew many of them on this great Revolt, and says to *Moses*, v. 1. *depart, and go up hence, thou and the People to the Land which I swear unto Abraham, saying, unto thy Seed will I give it;—and I will send an Angel before thee;—for I will not go up with thee, for thou art a stiff-necked People; lest I consume thee in the Way.* as if he had said, “Go up by yourselves; “you have made you other Gods, and “rejected me, I did promise to send an “Angel before thee, to conquer your Enemies, but I will have nothing to do with “you, go up by yourselves.” On this the People mourned, and *Moses*, as related in the Chapter immediately before this, goes up to the Lord, obtains the People’s Pardon, and a Promise of God’s going with them, v. 34. *Behold mine Angel shall go before thee.* It is supposed, I know, that the People mourned, for God’s saying, *Exod.* 33. that he would *send an Angel*, and *not go himself* with them; than which nothing is further from the Sense of the Place: The *Angel* is allowed to be *God the Son*; the Lord God, who gave them the Law;

who had delivered them out of Ægypt, and born them on Eagles Wings, Exod. 19. 3, 4. who had sworn to bring them into Canaan, whose Power and Goodness they had so long experienced; could they mourn for being under the Care and Protection of such a Friend? What greater Person could go with them? This Angel is God, a Co-equal, and Co-eternal Person of the Godhead. God the Father did go with them into Canaan, See Numb. 14. 23, 24. They shall not see the Land which I swear unto their Fathers.—but my Servant Caleb, him will I bring unto the Land. This is long after the Refusal mentioned, Exod. 33. 3. But your Friend don't know what sending an Angel means, nor could his Masters the Rabbi's inform him if they would; at least they would not if they could. Those blind Guides have in these Texts, as in all others that concern Christianity, misled us on Purpose; he may see what Angel is in H. there is no Occasion to transcribe it here.

BUT lest he should seem to rely only on a Rabbinical Interpretation of these Texts, your Friend says, we have the Authority of St. Stephen to ascribe the giving the Law to the Angel, who it is presumed is the Angel of the Covenant.

HAVE we not an equally good Authority, that the Law was given by *Angels*? *Gal. 3. 19. Heb. 2. 2. It was ordained by Angels; and spoken by Angels;* so it can't be presumed, as the *Apologist* says it may be, that the Law was given by that Person only, who is called the *Angel of the Covenant*, since he is not *Angels*; and all that your Friend has built on the Text above, falls at once: What signifies offering such *crude unexamined Arguments*? could he help seeing in his Concordance, when he looked for *Angel*, that the giving the Law was likewise ascribed to *Angels*?

IT is further urged from *1 Cor. 10. 4, 9.* that the *Israelites* were introduced into *Canaan* by the second Person, by Christ; therefore if the *Father* be stiled a *Consuming Fire*, so is the *Son* also.

THERE is not one Word in the Text above, about Christ's bringing them in; he indeed, in Conjunction with the other two Persons, did bring them in; and each Person did more peculiarly or separately perform that Part, which corresponded to his Part in the Execution of the Covenant, but all were concerned, and all acted in it. The Rock that followed them, or which supplied them with Water in the Wilderness, was a Type of Christ; and when they

murmured, *Numb.* 21. 6. and rejected the *Manna*, it was tempting *Christ*, and rejecting the *Bread of Life*, as the *Apostle* explains it ; but here is not one Tittle about the *Introduction* of the People into *Canaan*.

Secondly, the Term *Light*, though most commonly attributed to the Son, is sometimes also given to the Father, and according to the Interpretation given by some antient Writers, of *St James* 1. 17. once likewise bestowed on the *Holy Ghost*, where the first Person is stiled the Father of Lights, i. e. of the second and third.

THE first Part of this Sentence, that the Father is sometimes called *Light*, you are to take for granted, for here is not a Word to prove it ; but the Authority of some antient Writers is produced, that *St. James*, *Ch.* 1. 17. by *Father of Lights*, means, that the first Person is Father of the Son and *Holy Ghost* ; so the *Holy Ghost* is called a *Light* ; he was to prove, that the Term *Light* is sometimes given to the Father, instead of that gives us, Opinion for an Argument, that the *Holy Ghost* is called a *Light*, and makes him a Son to the first Person as well as *Christ* the second Person. If the first Person be Father to the *Holy Ghost*, the *Holy Ghost* must be Son to him. Is this establishing the Doctrine of the Trinity,

nity, or confounding it? Wants there any plainer Proof, that neither your Friend nor his Teachers know what the Scriptures mean when they speak about the Persons of the Godhead.

AND the *Nicene Creed*, calls *Christ, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God*, such I verily believe him to be; and understand by the Words, that Christ is as much God, as Light is Light, as much of the same Essence, as a Ray of Light is of the Essence of Light; the *Solar Fire* and *Solar Light* went then, as now, under the same Name, and the Creed-Makers might have the same Idea as *H. Light the Son of the Fire*. But suppose they did not clearly understand the Type, what follows?

And lastly (p. 20) If the Wind is a Type of the Holy Ghost,—we infer that it is also a Type of the Eternal Three, because the Works of אלהים God, are by Solomon also compared to the Motions of it.

WHAT we infer is this; (I hope tho' the *Apologist* has so injuriously endeavoured to persuade the World there was a Quarrel betwixt the Clergy and *H.* and that there is so now betwixt the *superior Clergy* and the *Editors*, which I can ascribe to no good Motive, yet I hope he would not make such *Idiots* of that *learned Body of Men*, as to join them

them with himself in such more than childish Reasoning.) *Solomon* says, *we know not the Way of the Wind, nor the מעשה Work of God who does every Thing.* I take the Meaning of the Text to be this; as we perceive not the Path of the Wind, neither do we perceive the Hand of God in every Thing; though it is in every Thing; but be that as it will; what Shadow of a Pretence is there to say, *Solomon* compares the Works of God to the Motions of the Wind? or if he did; are the Works of God, God himself? is God compared to it, because his Works are? but I have spoke of this before. p. 26. 28.

We come now to the *Cherubim*, (p. 21.)

The Prophet here, viz. Ezek. 1. 26. &c. plainly distinguishes the Cherubim from the Glory of the God of Israel.—

AND so has *H.* over and over again; and has shewn that כבוד יחזה the Person in *Jehovah*, or of the אלהים the God of *Israel*, whose Title is *Light* or *Glory*, is represented as King of *Israel*, which he is by Covenant; and that he appeared as a Man, encircled with *Glory*, as described by *Ezekiel*, with too much to transcribe here.

—And the Situation of the Throne over their (the *Cherubim's*) Heads, on which
was

was the Appearance of a Man; and over him the Appearance of the Glory of the Lord,—

WHAT is it we are aiming at? would we make the *Glory of the Lord* distinct from the *Man in Glory* on the Throne? Where does the Text say the *Glory of the Lord* was over or above the Man? it describes him, filled and surrounded with the *Glory*, as the Son of God now is, *in the Father* (the second Person, the *Eternal Light*) and the *Father in him*: Each Person of the Trinity is called *Father*, as well as *Jehovah* and *God*, and is so, in several Respects to Men.

—Denotes, that the *Seat of Majesty* was filled with the *Divinity of a Person*, infinitely superior to that of the *Cherubim*, which are represented only as *Supporters of his Throne*.

YOUR Friend places only the Man on the Throne, and the *Glory above* him; there was a Man in the *Cherubim*, now, what should make one Man infinitely Superior to another? or what is there to denote the *Divinity of the Person* on the Throne, but the *Appearance of the Glory* about him; The Man on the Throne was not God; but the Person who appeared there was the *God-Man*; the Man represented by a Man, and the *God* by *Light or Glory* around him. He was on the Throne above the *Cherubim*; and they support the Throne, these are the
Angels

Angels who were to bear him in their Hands. He was to have, and now has, all Power in Heaven and Earth put into his Hands by Cession from the Persons in the Covenant, from the Aleim, and by Covenant. Their being under the Throne by no Means makes them *subordinate*, in Nature or Essence, only expresses that it is the Divine Power, the Man who is Son of God, exercises, and is supported by, and that in Consequence of the Covenant. Your Friend mistakes the Case, in making the Glory of the Lord to be the *Glory and Majesty of the Godhead* or Trinity.

Mr. H. says he, (in the Note) *seems to have been appriz'd of this Repugnancy between his Explication of the Vision and the Context.*

How does he know what H. was apprized of, he having not read him? If he had, he would surely have been ashamed to have said *H. has confounded and blended together, two Representations which the Prophet had carefully distinguished, and directed us to consider a-part*, when H. has so carefully distinguished them, and allotted two different Designs to the two Representations. But,

The Face of a Man in the Cherubim was superfluous, to denote the Union of the two Natures

Natures in Christ, when—the Man—was on the Throne ; for there had been then two Representations of the same Thing.

IF the Man on the Throne encircled with Glory, denote the Union of the two Natures, then according to your Friend himself, *the Glory of Jehovah*, or of *the God of Israel*, was not the Glory and Majesty of the *Godhead*, but of the *God-Man*, and he has been all this Time confounding the two Representations ; and the *Context* not only bears but requires us to construe *תהת אלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* a *Substitute of the Aleim of Israel* ; since the *Glory of Jehovah*, or the *Glory of the Aleim of Israel*, is one Person, and the *Aleim of Israel* are *Three Persons*. The Persons could not appear to Sight, but by some Representations ; here is no other, but the *God-Man in Glory* (described to be a Brightness like that of Fire. v. 27.) *above* ; and the *Cherubim* in a *Cloud, Fire, Light*, (v. 4.) *below* : What now stood for the *Aleim of Israel*, but the *Cherubim* ?

IF Christ be represented in one Situation as *King*, Why is it superfluous to represent him in another, as united to one of those Persons who made the Covenant ? Why not the *Trinity* represented to Sight, as well as the *God-Man* ? The Parties in the Covenant, as well as he, who was to

F reign

reign for being the *Angel*, Agent, or Executor of it? or if it be necessary to represent the Trinity in Covenant, how could the second Person, with the Man united to him, be omitted in the Representation?

THE Objections, page 22, 23. that the Cherubim, cry Holy, Holy, Holy; give Thanks to and fall down before the Lamb, and the like, have been made twice in Print before; and the Answers stand unanswered yet: Indeed what your Friend objects was urged long since, by Mr. Bedford, in his *Observation and Examination*, and, though your Friend is more of a Gentleman than he, and has not condescended to those *low Scurrilities*; yet are the Objections more full, and urged homer to the Point; but if the *Cherubim*, as according to *H.* are Representatives of *Jehovah the Persons in the Covenant*, can it be any Objection to his Explanation, or rather is it not a strong Confirmation of it, that they *do* and *say*, what was to be *said* and *done* in Consequence of the Covenant. They cry, Holy, Holy, Holy; the Covenant shews them to be so. They give *Glory and Honour*, Rev. 4. and 5 Ch. *Thanks to the Lamb that had been slain*, and fall down before him, and so yield up the Power; all the Creatures must join in this Act, because it is in Consequence

sequence of the Covenant that the Power is given to the *Lamb*, who sat on the Throne, and was invested with the Emblems of Divinity, for having been slain.

YOUR Friend makes the Cherubim to be *Angels* whom he supposes *are the Ministers of God and Supporters of his Throne*; pray is Man an *Angel*, or Supporter of the Throne of God! or is there an Order of Angels like Men, and so figured by a Man in the Cherubim? Doth it not sound extremely harsh to your Ears, to talk of Creatures supporting the Throne of the Creator? Is there Beauty or Propriety in placing weak finite Beings, as Substainers of the Throne of the Almighty! Had he only placed them round the Throne, as Servants paying their Adoration, and ready to receive their Commands, it would have been a modest Picture; but to talk of the Lord God Almighty being supported by his own Creatures, surely is a strange Thought.

THE Agents, Fire, Light and Spirit are Vice-Roys under God, and perform what is done in this System, and God acts by them; and we never but once read of any other *Angels* in this System, except those assumed Appearances which the Persons of the Trinity put on; as when all Three appeared to *Abraham*, &c. But so much has

been wrote, and with so much Confusion, on this Subject of Angels, that I am very well assured you will never have a clear Idea of the Matter, till you have read *H.*

BUT in the next Place, (p. 24.) “ The
 “ Face of the Lyon and Man doth not ap-
 “ pear to have been united, your Friend
 “ says, any more than that of the Ox and
 “ Man.” The Text says the Faces of
 the Man and Lyon were on the left Side,
 and that of the Ox on the right; puts the
 Man’s first, then the Lyon’s on the same
 Side; after, that of the Ox on another Side;
 and yet there is no more Reason to conclude
 the two first were together, which are men-
 tioned together on the same Side, than that
 the Man and the Ox were joined, he says,
 who stood on different Sides. And what do
 you think, Sir? here are four Heads on one
 Body, two on one Side, and one on another;
 is it not more likely that two on the same
 Side were joined together, than that two
 should be so, which were on different Sides;
 because your Friend says, we may as well
 infer the Union of the one as the other?
 Four Heads on one Body must be all joined
 in one Sense, but here is a peculiar Union,
 as in what it represents, betwixt the Man
 and Lyon. You may see *Ezekiel*, 41. 18.
 that there was one of the Cherubims had
 two

two Faces ; *and the Cherub had two Faces, the Face of a Man, and the Face of a young Lyon.* In the Revelation, the Ox is interposed between the Lyon and Man, and that for a very Reason ; it is the Scene here represented of the Power being given to the *Lamb as slain*, so the Ox, the Fire, the Wrath, which separated the Divinity and Soul from the Body during the Death of Christ, stands between. But really, Sir, there is too much said on this Subject by *H.* to transcribe, and which ought to have been considered by your Friend, before he had objected.

Page 24. *The Prophet, says the Apologist, doth not call the Cherubim, the Visions of God ; It is the Brightness or Glory that the Prophet stiles the Appearance of the God of Israel, and that only ; and asserts positively, that there is not one Word of the Cherubim mentioned, where Ezekiel saw Visions of God.*

BUT what could induce your Friend to say so, and that so *peremptorily*? Chap. i. v. 1, 4. *The Heavens were opened, and I saw Visions of God, in the fifth Day of the Month, the Word of the Lord came expressly to Ezekiel,—and I looked, and behold a Whirlwind,—a great Cloud,—a Fire,—a Brightness,—out of the midst thereof, the Likeness of*
four

four living Creatures, &c. And pray now what is called here the *Visions of God*? In the same Breath that he saith, he saw *Visions of God*, he describes the *living Creatures* encircled with the Firmament. I saw *Visions of God*, says he, tells you the precise Day, affirms the Word of God came expressly to to him, and then he describes what he saw, *viz. the Cherubim*. Where is there any Thing stiled the *Appearance of the God of Israel*? I can see nothing stiled so. The Man on the Throne, with *Brightness round about him*, is said to be the *Appearance of the Likeness of the Glory of the Lord*, but there no such Phrase as the *Appearance of the God of Israel*; that is a pure Invention of your Friend's own. If it be the *Brightness or Glory* that the Prophet stiles the *Visions of God*, how came the Cherubim in the midst of that Glory, which goes up and down amongst them, v 13. and their Motion is said to be like it. Accordingly St. Paul calls them the *Cherubim of Glory*; and he must give me Leave to observe, that here is not only the *Brightness or Glory*, but the *Cloud*, or the *Spirit*, and the *Fire*, likewise attending them, whereas there is only the *Glory* around the Man on the Throne, " If the
 " Cherubim are the *Visions of God*, your
 " Friend

" Friend argues, that the *Wheels* are so too,"
page 25.

THEY are so; and what they represent
in this Vision, is explained by *H.*

NEXT, we have the Objection about
תחת repeated, which I have considered
before. *The Glory of the Lord* and the
Cherubim are indeed two distinct Represen-
tations; and the Context requires us to con-
strue תחת a *Substitute* of, and not *under*,
since *the Glory of the Lord* is only one Per-
son; but the God or אלהים of *Israel* are
three Persons. That is, when the Prophet
says the *Cherubim*, were תחת the Aleim of
Israel, he can't mean they were under the
Glory of *Jehovah*; for *the Glory* is not the
Aleim of *Israel*, though he is one of those
Persons.

THE *Editors* say, that *St. Paul* by his
Parallel, *Heb. 9. 24.* makes the *Cherubim*,
the Faces of God. The High Priest on
the great Day of Attonement was to go into
the *H. H.* and sprinkle the Blood of the Sa-
crifice on the Mercy-seat, to the Faces of
the *Cherubim*, which are called פני יחיה,
as you may, in the Citations in *H.* *St Paul*,
says, *Christ is not entered* (unto the holy
Things) *into the holy Places made with Hands*
the Figures of the true, but into Heaven it-
self, now to appear, in the Presence (to the
Face)

Face) of God, v. 12. with his own Blood, which he exhibits to God, as the Atonement of our Sins. Now, if the High Priest sprinkled the Blood *to* or *before* the Faces of the Cherubim, and what the Priest did, *was a Shadow of Heavenly Things*; then it follows unavoidably, that the Cherubim were the Symbolical Presence of God. The Cherubim were made out of the same Piece of Gold, and a continued Part of the Mercy-Seat, and their Eyes were towards the Mercy-Seat; the *H. H.* is *Heaven*; the High Priest, *Christ*; the Blood, the Blood of Christ; the High Priest carrying it into the *H. H.* Christ carrying his own Blood into Heaven; the High Priest's sprinkling of it on the Mercy-Seat, before or to the Faces of the Cherubim, Christ's exhibiting his Blood to God; and now, Sir, what were the Cherubim? Angels, Creatures! What have thy to do with the Attonement made for Sin? Away with such idle Stories, picked up from the Enemies of God, and his Christ. Your Friend need not have been so sanguine, in affirming, that not one Tittle of all this can be concluded from *St. Paul's Words*; but he gives us some *Reasons* for his Opinion, which I must consider.

First,

First, the Deity had been represented under the Image and Likeness of a Man.

Look to the Top of Page 22. and you will see your Friend was aware, it was not the *Divinity* but *Humanity* of Christ which was exhibited by the Head or Face of the Man in the Cherubim; and this *first Reason* is meer Chicanery, I can call it nothing else, if I call it any thing. God forbids Men from devising Images or Pictures of him out of their own Heads, but no where says, he had not given Similitudes of himself, but directly that he had done so.

Secondly, The Manifestation God condescended to make of himself in the Holy of Holies, was in the Cloud over the Mercy-Seat.

If by God, he means the Trinity; that is not true; it was the second Person who appeared and acted there; this is proved at large in Print, so I need not prove it again here.

Thirdly, Those Figures placed by God's Command in H. H. were different from those exhibited to Ezekiel,—being the simple, uncompounded Figure of a Man.

Who told your Friend so? Where did he get this? Would not his Author bear mentioning? are we to take it upon his bare Word? and what was a Man to stand

G upon

upon the Mercy-Seat for? What does *Ezekiel* mean, when he says, *I knew that they were the Cherubims*; the Image, as compounded of four Heads and one Body, is called a *Cherub*; *Ezekiel* ~~saw~~ four of these Representations; and says, he knew them to be *Cherubim*; and yet they are not the same Figure that is called a *Cherub*, twenty Times before, because they are not described before. Had the Scriptures said, those in the Temple were only *two Men*; he would have shewn us where; but because some infamous lying Apostate has said so, he chuses to believe it without the *least Shadow* of Evidence, and against what appears to me, the *direct* Authority of a Prophet; for what other *Cherubim* were they but those on the Ark, for the Prophet to allude to to, when he says, *I knew that they were the Cherubim, and the Likeness of their Faces was the same I saw by the River of Chebar*. To suppose one Prophet doth not mean by *Cherub* what another does, would authorize us to suppose, that they don't speak of the same God, though they use the same Words; for you may as well suppose, that *Moses's* God is different from *Ezekiel's*, as that his *Cherubim* are: The Scriptures give no Hint that way: They only tell us, that in the Temple there were *but two*, and that

that in *Ezekiel's* Vision there were four, Figures : Now to say they did'n mean the same *Figure* by the same Appellation, is making the Holy Spirit to dictate to his Scribes in a more vague shuffling Stile, than the Author of a Riddle writes in ; and what can be the Consequence of such Assertions, but justifying the Enemy, in making a Jest of the Word of God and us ? In *Genesis*, the Cherubim are *Angels* in Person, in *Exodus*, they are *Men* ; in *Ezekiel*, they are *Beasts*, and stand for *Angels*. What is this ?

did not.

“ LASTLY, your Friend cites *Prideaux* that the Cherubim in the Temple stood with their Faces *inward*, in the Posture of Figures *worshipping* ; not with their Faces *outward*, as Figures to be *worshipped*.”

I should have thought looking upward with Knees bent to the *Glory of God* above, had more properly expressed them as *worshipping* ; not looking down upon the Blood of Christ sprinkled upon the Mercy-Seat, and filling *Heaven* (for the *H. H.* was *Heaven*) with their Wings. So that *Jehovah*, when he appeared there, appeared under their Wings, and Christ in the High Priest acted under the Shadow of their Protection ; an high Honour for two Men to

have. The Wings of the Cherubim filled the Extent of *H. H.* the Type of Heaven; 2 *Par.* 3, 11. Their Faces looked one to another, and towards the Mercy-Seat; *Exod.* 25. 20. and 2 *Par.* 3. 13. Their Faces were *לְבֵית* to the Temple, and so outwards; *בְּבֵית, בִּיתָה, or מִבֵּית* are inward, as you may see in *Marius*; they were to see not only what was done on the Mercy-Seat, but what was done without in the outer Temple; and their Faces might be seen in the *Holy Place* or middle Temple over the *Vail*. I now submit it to you, whether your Friend don't rather make you suspect he did'n understand the Subject, than that *H.* has failed in his Explication of this Hieroglyphical Figure? But why, once more, should he think he has confuted *H.* supposing he could shew the short Extract in the *Proposals*, did'n sufficiently clear up these important Points?

WE come now to *H.*'s *Philosophical Principles*, page 27. First—he jumbles two Things together, which Moses has made distinct; for the Creation of Light was prior to the Formation of the Heavens.

YOUR Friend, Sir, jumbles two Things together, that are widely different, viz. Creation and Formation; the Substance of Light was created when every thing else was,

was, but was not *formed* till after the *Spirit* was; and was the second Step in the *Formation* of the Heavens, for *they two* with the *Fire*, are the *Heavens*. Light was divided from, or formed by dividing of the Darkness, and was the Produce of the first Day. When the *Spirit* and the *Light* were formed (and they supported by God himself, for want of the Solar-Fire) they raised a Firmament or Expansion, and divided the Waters; would the *Apologist* insinuate that Light is not Part of that Substance, or created Fluid, which is called first, רקיע Expansion, and then, שמים *Heavens*? The acting of the two Agents as a Firmament, was not till the second Day, but they were formed the first Day, though not called either *Firmament* or *Heavens*, till afterwards. This is made so plain in the *Principia*, that it doth not admit of a Dispute.

Secondly, the *Firmament* which Moses says expressly, God called שמים, *Heavens*, H. styles the *Expansion*.

He does indeed translate רקיע by *Expansion*, rather than *Firmament*, but does as expressly call it שמים as 'tis possible.

—Which brings that Stress or Compression on all Bodies it meets with.—Causes the Variation of Times and Seasons, &c. Whereas
Moses

Moses teaches us that the Sun and Moon, &c. were appointed for Times and for Seasons.

H. says the very same, and has shewn at large, that they, viz. their Orbs, were placed in the Firmament, to support its Power, and how they support it; and that they are for the Use or Purport of Times and Seasons, that the Firmament is the Agent; they passive Instruments. There are various Words in the first of Genesis that have the same Sense put upon them, which H. has traced and distinguished; would your Friend but examine the Principia, he would soon see, that he objects to H. only because he has not distinguished the Ideas of the Words, and doth not know what H. does say.

Thirdly, H. says, that it is not the Sun but Light of the Sun,—which is said to rule the Day, though Moses ascribes the same Effect to be wrought by the greater Light.

THE Light of the Sun is the greater Light, for what other Light is there greater? Moses says, the greater Light, meaning the Solar-Light, rules the Day, and H. says, the Solar-Light rules the Day, and yet he is represented as contradicting Moses.

Fourthly, and to mention no more,—I affirm, that the Sun, or Solar-Fire, called in Scripture

Scripture, **חָרַם** is both said to rise, *Judg.* 8. 13. **מִלְמַעְלָה חָרַם**—and in the Note, **עָלָה** denotes emphatically, a constant progressive Motion upwards.

עָלָה is to ascend. But it is not a Verb, but Adverb in the Text, and says no more nor less than *before the Sun was above, or over them*: Says nothing what moves or stands still, only that *the Sun was not yet above*; It is above when it shines down upon us.

—And to set; *Judg.* 14. 18. **יָבֹא הַחֶרֶם** **בְּטָרֵם**, *before the Sun went down*; and in the Note, **בָּוֹא** is said in a more especial Manner to be applied to the setting of **שֶׁמֶשׁ** the Sun.

THE Word **בָּוֹא** occurs a great Number of Times, and its general Import is to go, or cause to go from one Place to another; as you may see by examining a few Places; and has no Relation at all to Ascent or Descent, *H.* has cleared this among other Words; ¹ Above should have been printed, **בְּטָרֵם יָבֹא הַחֶרֶם**, which makes a great Difference; for then, **הַחֶרֶם** is not the Nominative Case to **יָבֹא**; and the Final **ה** is local; and signifies to, or towards; before it went from **הַחֶרֶם** towards the Sun; during the last Day of the Marriage Feast, before it, the Place where they were, was gone

gone from the Light ; as we say *it rains*, &c. and as in those Expressions of, *it turned Morning, it turned Evening*, and the like, which occur frequently. The *Schemosh* is said נִמְצָא to be gone or got into another Hemisphere ; and here the *Place* is said to be going from where it was, viz. from the Light into the Dark, or from being towards the Sun : When we speak of a Person's going from one Place into another, which is nearer to us, or the Place where we are ; we express it by *coming*, but the Idea is still the same. The Scriptures assert the Earth moves, and both can't move.

—It is unscholar-like to obtrude an Interpretation on the Words of Job 9. 7. which every Reader must discern to be a voluntary Misrepresentation, and a bare-faced Perversion of their Meaning. Job, speaking of the irresistible Power of the Almighty, recounts several stupendous Acts of it, in controlling and superseding the ordinary Phænomena of natural Agents, who removeth the Mountains, &c.

AND is he not speaking likewise of his stupendous Power and Wisdom, in the Formation and Contrivance of the Universe ? Let us see.

Job, 9. 5. הַמַּעֲתִיק *whom made durable (or strong)*
the Mountains. * There is as much Power
 shewn in laying the Foundations of the
 Mountains, as in overturning them at the
 Flood;—*who overturned them in his Anger,*
who shaketh the Earth out of her Place, and
the Pillars thereof tremble. H. by compar-
 ing all the Places together, where these Pil-
 lars are spoken of, has shewn that Columns
 of Light and Spirit are the Pillars or Sup-
 porters of the Earth, and that they move it.
 Then here is another stupendous Act of
 divine Power in a *settled* Law of Nature
 spoken of, *viz.* The Motion of the Earth,
 in, and by the Fluid of the Air, on which
 so much depends. But supposing the Earth
 fixed or to stand still, when was it that the
 Earth was *shook out of its Place*? The
 Flood dissolved its Parts, but did'n move
 the Orb out of its Place; your Friend sees
 some surprising Act of divine Wrath here,
 I wish he had told us what it is. The
 Words refer, if I understand them, to a
 glorious Act of Power, and extremely be-
 neficial to us, as well as surprising, that
 the Earth should swim round the Sun, and
 turn on its own Axis, with that Axis in-
 H clined

* Vid. Leigh's Crit. Sacra: Gnathack, signi-
 fies, Durance, Hardness, Antiquity.

clined, that its Pillars every Moment lengthen and shorten, and we not so much as perceive any Inconvenience from such a Vertigo, and Tremor of its Supporters; and I have as much or *more*, Reason to say, it is the *stated Laws of Nature*, Job is displaying God's Power from, as your *Apolo-gist* has to say the contrary.—*Who commandeth* (or *has commanded*) הָרָם and it *riseth not*; this is another very surprising Disposition of Things, that the Solar-Fire which keeps all a moving should not *burn out*, which it would do, did it *rise* like the *Shemosh*, and which Fire on the Earth, does,—and *sealeth up* (has sealed up) the *Stars*; that is, fixed them in their Place.—*Which alone spreadeth out the Heavens*, that is, has given them their *Expansive* Power, as *H.* has shewn the Words signify; and now, Sir, is it so very visible that the Words of *Job* are misrepresented, that your Friend should call it a *voluntary and bare-faced Perversion*! Language which shews nothing but ill Manners, and is an uncharitable Censure.—*Would you think it possible any one—would cite this Text to prove that the Scriptures no where ascribe Motion to the Sun?*

Nobody has cited it for any such Purpose; but if we can't confute what they say, we must suppose them to say what we can

can confute. It was cited to shew there is a Body of Fire round the Sun, which doth not *rise up* as the Light does; and I still think it says as much, notwithstanding the *Apologist's* sanguine Opinion to the contrary.

—*Till this Point (the Philosophy) has been proved to the Satisfaction of impartial Judges; no Complaint can reasonably be made against those who do not encourage the Publication proposed.*

Is your Friend impartial whilst he condemns him unsight, unseen? how does he know whether *H.* has proved his Point or no?

WE are now to consider *H.* as a Critick in the *Hebrew Tongue*?

9. *Whether H. has given substantial Reasons for rejecting the Points, all the idle Rules (i. e.) I believe all in general.*—

WHY does he believe so? *H.* has shewn, that many of the Rules of Grammar will hold, and if your Friend would but read him, before he undertakes to answer him, he need neither follow, nor oppose, him blindly and in the Dark.

The masoretical Pointings (p. 30.) have their Use.—First these Pointings determine the precise Meaning of such Hebrew Words

as are sometimes of very different and opposite Significations.

WERE the Pointers inspired? if not, what Authority have they to determine the Meaning of the Words of the Prophets, and doth'n this make the Scriptures the *Word* of these Men and not of God, and so build our Faith on human Testimony? But there are no such ambiguous Words, unless he will make a Word having a *Typical, Emblematical or Memorial* Sense fixed to it, as *זבח* *Sacrifice* and *Sinner*, &c. and some few *Particles* be such. The two Conjugations of *Pibal* and *Pual* are meer Whims, and the Context alone enables you, when you have got the leading Ideas in the Words, to fix their Parts of *Speech*, and Grammatical Variations, and if it could not, who gave these Apostates Power to do it, or whence had they Skill enough? It had been a dead Language long enough before they medled with it; he produces an Instance of the Ambiguity of the Word *אל*, which has received various Interpretations, according to its three-fold Signification of God, not, and to, or towards, and observes that the Sentence *אל חסדך* *Psal.* 52. 1. is variously rendered in different Versions.

לֹא can't be rendered *to* here, it must have come before דָּוָה, to be so rendered; it must come before the Noun to be a *Preposition*. That of the LXX is a very poor Performance; they were either very *ignorant*, or very *wicked*; a great Part of their Translation is neither Sense nor Grammar; read a Page or two in the *Psalms*, or *Job*, and you will soon be convinced. They have not *translated* לֹא, at all in the Text above; the Ambiguity is in דָּוָה, which they did'n understand. Nor does the *double Interpretation* which is often given by the *Seventy*, shew the Text will not always *itself determine its Sense*, but only that they either did not understand, or were resolved we should not, through them, understand the Text. Neither your Friend perhaps, nor myself may be able to construe all the Scriptures; look into your Commentators, and see the various Constructions that are given of numberless Passages, notwithstanding the *Certainty of the Points*, and the *Rabinical Rules*; and the numberless Texts, which, as they stand, are *Nonsense*, or *Falsities*, or are contradictory to others, though construed by those Rules. I have mentioned a few. In short the *Rabbi's* (let their Name be for ever buried in Oblivion, or their Memory stink as it deserves) have confounded almost

^{whole} almost the Scriptures, and now certain Rules are fixed, and the Genius of the Tongue discovered, and supported by numberless Instances out of the Scriptures themselves, we must be stunned with Noise and Nonsense about a Parcel of *Vagabonds*, whom many Writers that have examined them, declare to *be forsaken of God, and Common Sense*; you may see enough of this in, *H.* and I shall not transcribe.

Thirdly, the Points settle the Orthography of the Hebrew Words, Page 31.

THE *Hebrew Words* consist of Letters, and you may fix a Sound to every Letter, if you please; if not, we can *construe* it without. I can't help mentioning here, * a very ingenious and sensible Performance, the Author of which, I am utterly a Stranger to, who has with great Sagacity and Happiness fixed a distinct Sound to every Letter, and shewn which Letter in the more modern Alphabets, correspond to those of the *Hebrew*, and so we don't want the Points for that Purpose. The Authority and Antiquity of the *Points* have been examined before now, and there is the slenderest Evidence imaginable of their having

* The Title is, The true antient Way of pronouncing *Hebrew*, &c, by T——s Cl——gs.

having been invented sooner than 500 Years after Christ. The LXX. it is agreed on all Hands, knew nothing of them ; (*Ezra* and *Nebemiah* make no Mention of any such Thing, and St. *Jerom* takes no Notice of them, nor any other Author between *Ezra* and *Jerom*,) your Friend's Instance of the various Spelling of *שׁמ* in the LXX. is Proof sufficient they knew not, or would not teach us, how the ancient *Jews* pronounced the *Hebrew* Words; and if the *Jews* four hundred Years before Christ, knew nothing of it, how should the *Masorites* know any thing of it 5 or 600 Years after Christ, when it had been a dead Language almost a thousand Years ?

BUT the Points, says your Friend, teach us to pronounce *שׁמ* thus *Shemesh* ; and thereby acquaint us, that they knew nothing of *H*'s Etymology, which requires us to read it *Shemosh*.

WITH all my Heart ; *H*. wants not, nor values their Authority, but it is a Mistake that his Etymology requires you to write it *Shemosh*, *שׁ* is the Root to *recede*, though the Dictionaries put it under *שׁ*. *H*. hath not meddled with the Orthography; what he laboured was the Orthodox-Construction of the Words : His Etymologies have nothing at all to do with the spelling
of

of the Words, when put into other Characters; but is it likely the *Masorites* knew how to pronounce a Word, which neither the LXX. nor *Josephus* did so many Years before?

And by these Means, lastly, they guard us against the bold and licentious Attempts of Criticks.

CRITICISMS supported on Rules, supported on Examples out of the Scriptures themselves, will never be called *bold* and *licentious*, but by those who expect their own *ipse dixit* should pass for Authority.

—Who, disdaining to be confined by Rule, venture to obtrude their own Interpretations on the sacred Text.

AND why is not this or that Man's own Interpretation as good as another's own Interpretation? A Christian's own Interpretation, as an Apostate Jew's own Interpretation? The Apostates have obtruded a Parcel of Rules on us, by which they have obtruded such Interpretations of their own, on the sacred Text as makes it the *filliest* Stuff ever wrote; and they have no Regard to those, which they own to be the general Rules of the Language; such as *ו* being the plural Termination Masc. any more than your Friend has, who p. 21, &c. several Times construes *אלהי ישראל* to be

one Person; though, he must know that by the Rule, *אלהים* is plural, and so necessarily, two or more. You may see a great deal in *H.* about these same Rules of the *Rabbies*; he had examined them all, and publicly declared, he would engage to shew, there was not one Rule of their own, but was designed to evade some Text of Scripture of Consequence to the Christian Cause. Many, or most of the Grammar Rules are contrary to the Genius of the Tongue; e. g. The Method of *conjugating* Verbs makes false Concord of a thousand Places; you need go no further than the first Chapter of *Genesis* to see the Truth of what I say, in the General.

“ BUT if *H.* set aside the *Rabinical* Edicts, he should have given us others in their Room.” He has done so!

But it is not said what Method he took to enable himself to construe the Scriptures, and find out the genuine Sense of the Hebrew.

IT is a sad Thing, a Man will shut his Eyes and be perpetually complaining he can't see. The *Proposals* don't say it, but it is said in his Writings: But he is a Christian fighting with Apostates, and so did not deserve to be read by a Christian Divine.

YOUR Friend's Fear, that the discarding of the Points, and the (Rabinical) Rules of Grammar will most effectually discourage
I the

the Study of Hebrew, and consequently bring it into real Disrepute, makes me laugh.

Is it possible it should be in greater *real Disrepute*, than it is at present? Were ever any Set of Men so despised and ridiculed as the *Hebrews*, and all their Learning and Knowledge, by the great Men of the present Age! so slighted, that perhaps not one in a hundred, even of the Clergy, know so much as the *Letters* of the Language? Were the *Hebrew* in the least Credit,—those designed for Holy Orders would be examined in it at the Universities; at least at their Ordination, since the *New T.* so often refers us to the *Old*, for the Evidence of Christianity. But let me appeal to two Authors, one at the Top of Polite Learning, and perhaps a Man of as fine an Imagination, and as smart a Writer as the Age has produced; and the other as grave and Orthodox a Divine as the Age is blest with. Dr. *Middl-ton* I mean for the one, and Dr. *Stebbing* for the other; the first, the reputed Author of a Letter to Dr. *W.* and some Pieces about the Miracles supposed to be wrought in the first Age of the Church; for which I return him my hearty and sincere Thanks; being in my humble Opinion *now* doing great Service to the Christian Cause. But would a Man of his Sense have

have represented the *Jews* in so contemptible a Light, and given such broad Hints, that he looked upon the *Hebrew* Scriptures, as little better than a Fable, had he not, *unfortunately* for himself and the learned World, been led into the Mistake, that the *Jews* before Christ were such Idiots as have been since ; and that their Language and Scriptures make no better a Figure in themselves, than they do as they lay covered with *Rabbinical Dirt* and *Filth*. Or would a grave and Orthodox Divine, have supposed, and in Print declared, that a future State was no constituent Part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*, and that the Sanctions of the Jewish Law were Temporal only, purely Temporal. That the Jews did not understand their own Law ; and so have made the Church of God a Parcel of Brutes, worshipping they knew not whom, nor what, to have their Bellies filled? would I say, so great a Man have wrote in this Manner, could he have read the *Bible*, and if *Hebrew*, which contains two Thirds of the *Written Word*, and the Evidence of the whole, be in such Disrepute with our Top-Divines, what greater Disrepute can it be in? That *H.* has not discouraged the Study of the *Hebrew* is pretty apparent, since the Value of *Hebrew*

Books are risen Cent. per Cent. and some others sunk as much.

Lastly, I do not understand what those Stories of the Jews are, which H. rejected, says your Friend.

HAD he looked he might have seen, *H.* has given an Account at large, in his *Hebrew Writings, perfect.* The *Rabinical Learning* is pleaded for, Page 33. and till you have compared what *Rabinical Commentators* have said on Scripture Subjects, with what *H.* has said, you can't possibly be any Judge of this Part of the Dispute and till your Friend instances in *some one obscure Passage of the Levitical Law*, or one Particular, relating to the *Passover*, that has been cleared up by the Help of the *Rabbies*, I shall only say, that by what I have seen of them, their chief Study has been to obscure all the *Levitical Law*.

—*St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, grounds all his Arguments, on the Tenets and Doctrines of the Rabbies,*

JUST as much as he does upon the *Alcoran*; the *Rabies* and their Tenets were not then in being; the Apostates of his Time, as those in our Lord's, had a Set of Traditions, which made the Word of God of none Effect, and for which they are severely condemned by our Lord, and we cautioned

over

over and over again from giving Heed to any of their Traditions ; as *St. Paul* does in Particular, from giving Heed to *Jewish Fables*, to those who desired to be Teachers of the Law, but understood neither what they said, nor whereof they affirmed, vain Janglers. Christ tells the Jews in his Time, that when he left them, the Devil would take a sevenfold more Possession of them ; and yet now, an Apostle is brought in, as grounding all his Arguments on the Tenets and Doctrines of the *Rabies*, the Heirs of this Curse on their Fathers. How directly opposite *St. Paul* and those *Apostates* are, you may see by one Instance. *St. Paul* grounds all his Arguments on the Law having a Shadow only of the good Things to come ; they, all theirs, on the Sacrifices, Washing, &c. being Principals, not Types, the real and ultimate Atonement, he preaches a suffering Messiah, they a Temporal Prince ; but perhaps your Friend means, they both argue from the Scriptures ; in what other Respect they agree I know not. The *Rabies* do appeal to Scripture, as construed by one another, as the Church of *Rome* does, and would be Teachers of the Law, but do not, as *St. Paul* says of them, understand it, or what they affirm about it ; which is just the Case with some other People at present.

IT

It would take up too much Time to examine the *Targums* here, and shew that even they did not know a great Deal; but they were much honeſter Men, and quite of another Stamp than the *Jewiſh Doctors* ſince; and Things make quite another Appearance in their Paraphraſtical Tranſlations. It is not *their Aſſiſtance*, but it is the *Authority* of the *Rabbies*, the *Talmuds*, *Miſhna*, *Gemara*, he cries out againſt; but by all Means, let Chriſtians read the LXX. and *Targums*; H. is far from diſcouraging us I am ſure.

The later Rabbies may help us in ſuch Points as no ways concern our Faith,—in their civil or religious Cuſtoms.

THE Whole of the Bible concerns our Faith; and *their* (if he Means the *Mosaic*) *religious Cuſtoms* were the Pictures of what we believe; and are declared ſo by our Lord and his Apoſtles; and would have been ſeen to be ſo long ago, had not learned Men *cleared* and *opened* the Law, by the Aſſiſtance of the *Rabbies*.

It appears to me then, ſays your Friend, and ſo it will preſently to you,

I dare ſay it don't appear yet, if ever it will,—that H. rejected the Points and Rules, and Stories of the Apoſtles,—because he was
resolved

resolved his Fancy and Imagination should not be restrained.

No Man indulged Imagination less, having put no Sense upon a Word which it will not bear in *every Place* it occurs in, in the Bible, and which it *must* have in *some*; and has laid himself under Restrictions which no Writer ever did before, as you will see if you read him. If the *Rabbies* have wrote any thing that does not concern Christianity, your Friend may make the most of them; *H.* has only attacked them on what they have wrote, which does affect it, and before we leave this Subject, let me say once for all, that if your Friend, or any one else, will take any of these Rules of Construction, or of Grammar, which *H.* has rejected, and shew they can be supported by uncontradicted Authorities from Scripture; or will shew that any he has laid down cannot be supported by such Authorities, I will submit; and as to the *Points*, if he will produce *one* Text that cannot be construed without them; I will produce *ten*, that *can* be construed without, and are not Sense as they stand construed by them. The *Greek* and *Latin* are dead Languages as well as the *Hebrew*; do we not try the Rules of Grammar by Authorities out of *Greek* and *Latin*

Latin Authors? Why not do the same in *Hebrew*? The Grammar is in the Language, or else it is no Language at all. The *Points* are no Part of the Language, the *Letters* are; the Language had been writ above two thousand Years before a *Point* was ever heard of; surely they had some Rules of Grammar which they writ by; and if there ever was Grammar in the *Words*, it is there still; whether *H.* has found it or no, I am ready to contest with your Friend. We desire no more than to have the *Words* as the Prophets writ them; let him keep the *Points*, which are an Addition made by the *Synagogue* of Satan; as to any other Rules, *H.* has rejected none, but what he saw could not be supported, and were designed to mislead us; and it is meer Calumny in the *Apologist* to cry out, that,

H. rejected all the Assistances that could be had either from the Jewish or Christian Commentators; or from the antient Versions, or lastly from the neighbouring Languages.

ALL this, I say, is meer Calumny, since it is so well known he has made use of all those Helps. He has shewn the immense Distance betwixt the *Hebrew* and the neighbouring Languages; but has consented, with Restrictions mentioned, to make use of them,
in

in construing a Word that occurs but once or twice in the Bible ; but God be thanked there are *few* of those Words ; those of the greatest Importance occur too often to need any other Help, than comparing the Places together, and a Mind unbiaſſed by *Rabbinism*, to fix their Sense and Meaning.

ETYMOLOGY, I ſuppoſe, is tracing a Word up to its *Radix*, which may be done with far greater *Certainty* and *Facility* in *Hebrew* than in any other Language, for many Reasons ; as it was the firſt Language, it muſt be *unmixed* and unconfounded by borrowed Words ; the Letters in a *Root* are few, and the Changes made in a Word, by Grammatical Reflections, very ſmall, moſtly by the Addition or Inſertion of a Letter or two, and, that *the ſame* in all other Words ; and its general Rules have few or no Exceptions, &c. But what he has done that way, is far from being unsupported by other ſtrong Reasons, beſides the Similarity of the Derivation in other Caſes, *e. g.* before he came to, or thought of the Derivation of כְּרִבִּים, he had proved, that that Figure was a Picture or Hieroglyphical Representation of the Perſons in *Jehovah*, and of him that was to be, and now is, taken into the Eſſence, and exalted above every Name that is named in this World

K

and

and the next. He had found out, that the שמים were *Rulers* or *Disposers* in this System; and the *Names* or *Substitutes* or *Types* of the three Persons in *Jehovah*, who are called *Fire*, *Light*, *Spirit*, before ever he derived שמים from שם to *dispose*, *order*, or *place*, and so as a *Noun*, a *Name*, as that is put for the Thing itself.

But not one Instance can be produced, where שמים signifies Names; the plural Noun being always written שמות.

Who knows not this? Hath not *H.* said so, and given a Reason, why שם which in the singular Numb. is *Name*, and when used for a Person of *Jehovah*, as it often is, and is then *Masculine*, should have the *Masculine Termination* likewise, when applied to the *Agents* in the Air, which bear the same Names, as the Persons in *Jehovah*? Christ is called *Light*, and the *Word*, there is a Condition of the Air likewise called *Light* and the *Word*, and so on; and the Reason why he chose to construe שמים by *Names*, rather than *ruling Agents*, or some such Term, was from the clear and distinct Idea they give us of a *Trinity* in *Unity*; the Word so rendered being a constant Memorial, that the *Cœlestial Fire*, *Light* and *Spirit* are *Names* or *Representatives*. Custom hath not yet familiarized it to our Ears, and it sounds

sounds odd; this and an Instance or two more of the same Nature, have been of great Use to the *Learned*, and served as a Ball to play with: Your Friend gives one, two, three different Etymologies of שמים; all right no Doubt of it. First a *Rabinical* one, which he seems to adopt more particularly, as his own, viz. מים שם Waters-there; and Scripture affords us some Light in this Enquiry. There the Almighty is said to have called the Firmament, which he had made to divide the Waters that were below, from those which were above; שמים Heaven.

THEN this should have been the Name, of the Space above Heaven, and not of Heaven itself, since the Waters are not there, but above it; and this fine Etymology has broke its own Neck.

This simple and easy Explication of the Name, agrees with other Expressions of Holy Writ; which acquaints us there are Waters above the Heavens, Psal. 148. 4. and that God opened the Windows, or Flood-Gates, or Doors of Heaven.

THERE were Waters, whilst the Hollow of the Earth was full of Air, above Air or Heaven, but there are none such now; and you may as well put in were as are into the Text above; there is no Verb Substantive there at all. The Flood-Gates,

or Windows, or Doors, or Passages for or, of the Air, must be Openings in some Wall; H. has explained them and given an *intelligible and defensible Account of the Formation, Deluge, and Reformation of the Earth.*

But what Reason can be assigned, why the Firmament should be called the Names, because it divided the Waters from the Waters,

As good a one, as why it should be called *Waters-there*, because it was a Water-divider. It is a Pity *DW* had not signified to *divide*: Can't we find no Word that sounds like *DW*, or looks something like it in *Irish, Welsh or Arabick*, which signifies to divide, part, or split; or suppose it formerly signified so in *Hebrew*, though the *Root* be now wore out or lost! *Water-Divider* would do; but *Waters-there* hath two ugly Objections to it; in the first Place the Text says, the Waters are not *there*, but *above* it; in the next Place there is no Reason why it should be called *Waters-there*, because it was a *Water-divider*. Such, Sir, such ridiculous Nonsense contrary to itself, to Scripture, to common Sense is the Stuff fetched from the *Rabies*. He might have had several other Etymologies from the *Jewish Doctors*, as good or better than this.

BOCHART

BOCHART gives us another Etymology, deriving it from the Arabic Root *ع* *Emi* nere, and your Friend, who can tell, whether the Hebrew Tongue also had not formerly the Verb *עמד* of the same Import,—now lost?

I don't like this Arabic Derivation, because the Word was in Use, and most likely had an Etymology, about 3000 Years before the *Arabians*, or their Language were in Being; and the Derivation from *עמד* with his *who can tell*, I leave till Somebody does tell. *עמוד*, High Places, may very likely be borrowed from the *Phœnicians*, and derived from *עמד*, since it was those Agents the High Places were dedicated to, and which had Images bearing the same Name.

It is old stale Cant, that any thing that implys Knowledge in it, is too abstruse and intricate for the Genius of the Hebrew Language, and for the Simplicity of the primæval State of Mankind.

THEY had God for their Instructor in the primæval State, and he formed the Hebrew Language, and what wonder, if the Words have a Meaning, and that expressive of the real Ideas of Things? and for the Truth of this, I appeal to what H. has wrote.

If

If Shemosh, the Light (p. 38.) was designed to typify the second Person in the Trinity, and by its Name express and signify this, how comes it to pass, that the Light was not originally called שמש? The Original and proper Name of Light was אור.

THE Solar-Light was called שמש long before Genesis was wrote, and אור is a proper Name for Light; and Christ is often called אור, and כבוד, another proper Name of Light. מארת is the Orbs of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, which were framed to support the Action of Fire which makes Light. The Orb of the Sun to make Light originally, the other to return it at second Hand, so are conjointly a מארת, an Instrument for the Use of Lights to send it to the Earth, as expressed, *to give Light upon the Earth*; and the sacred Historian does not once mention the Word שמש in the first of Genesis, because he doth not once in that Ch. speak of that Moiety of the Heavens issuing in Light from the Sun, as distinct from the Solar-Fire, and the other Streams of Light, which Shemosh is used for.

If your Friend don't like the Etymology of אור, the running Orb, as it is borrowed from Commentators and Dictionaries, he may reject it, only don't let him blame us for making use of them, 'tis theirs, not ours.

What

What has made that Confusion in the Etymologies of *Hebrew* Words, is giving Heed to *Jewish Fables*; and as long as the *Learned* are called *Learned*, for mudling in that Heap of *Blasphemy* and *Nonsense*, the *Rabbinical* Writings; so long, not only the *Etymologies*, but the *Grammar* and *Sense* and *Credit* of the Scriptures, will be *uncertain*, and *inconclusive*; a Jest to the Enemy, and an *Ignis fatuus* to Friends. The *Hebrew*, I don't mean *Chaldæ*, or *Rabienism*, is as different from other Languages, and exceeds them as much in its *Conciseness* and *Perfection* as possible.

As to your Friend's Question, (p. 39.) *What doth an Etymology prove or shew, which is itself disputed.*

WHY, just as much as if it had not been disputed; and in this Case, I hope, more; since the *little* that is opposed, and that in general Terms, will serve to convince every impartial Person, that nothing material can be objected. But what is there that is not disputed! and what End can we expect of Disputes, when People raise them against what they never saw; I mean here, the Reasons for *H's* Etymologies, which your Friend never saw, at least don't take any Notice of them?

HE

WE are now got to Page 40. where H. is charged not only with *Translations* that throw *Obscurity* and *Confusion* on the *Context*, but which have a worse *Tendency*, viz. to turn the *literal Meaning* of *Scripture* into *Allegory*. Gen. 1. 1.—We are taught to read, “in the *Summit* God created the *Names*.”

WHO taught him to read it in the *Summit*? not H. nor the *Proposals*, where did he pick this up! H's using *Names* for the *Heavens*, may be obscure, to you, who have never read him, nor perhaps the *Proposals* through; because you don't know what *Idea* the *Author* has fixed to the *Word*; but that he therefore throws *Confusion* and *Obscurity* on the *Text* itself, you will look on, I dare say, as a *Charge* that shews only a strong *Inclination* to prejudice you against him.

—Now this חקופה *rotative Motion* here (*Psal. 19.*) attributed to the *Light*, it is conceived, is directly repugnant, not only to H's *Principles*.

I am sorry I am so often obliged to observe, that your *Friend* doth not know what H's *Principles* are, which he is opposing; but fights in the *Dark*, and strikes at he knows not *what*, nor *why*. Your *Friend* affirms the *Note*, that חקופה is here the *Revolution*

lution of the Sun round its own Orb, in its annual Course; the Orb makes no Revolution; nor does the Text speak of the Orb, but Light of the Orb; if there be a *Plenum*, and the Matter of the Heavens reach from the Sun, to beyond the fixt Stars, and Part be melted down at the Sun continually into Light and issue thence in Rays every Way to the Circumference, what becomes of it, when it is got to its *ne plus ultra*? it must return back again, and the Word is as properly used, to this Return from all Parts, from every Point of the Circumference of the Sphere, to the Center, as any Word in the Tongue; after what *H.* has wrote on this Head, your Friend should have given us something besides his own *say so*; an *Affirmation* passes in *England* for an Oath, but wont pass in reasoning for an Argument.

Psal. 96. 11. is another Instance produced of the *Obscurity and Confusion* *H.* throws on the Text, which he translates.

Let the Airs irradiate, and the Earth revolve; and the chief Objection to this is, that he has not cleared the Ideas of *עלן* and *רנן*, as well as *שמח* and *לן*; it not being clear to the Apologist, why the Heavens may not be said to rejoice as well as the Field and Trees to be joyful.

L

WOULD

Would it not have been rational in your Friend to have examined whether those Words have not also each of them a *natural material* Idea as well as the other? and have tried how the Sense would then have run together?

THE Heathens had rejected the true God, and chosen the *Heavens*, the *Creature*, in his *Stead*, and abused all those Informations God had given them by *Imagery*, *natural* and *Artificial*, such as Trees, Flowers, Streams in Paradise, the Cherubim, &c. and made every Thing almost a Representative of their God in some of its Powers or Attributes; so the Prophets who predicted the *Confusion of this false Confession*, express it often by covering the *Heaven* with Darkness, extinguishing the Light of the Sun, blasting the Trees (which they made Emblems, and in Groves of which, they worshipped) and promise *new Heavens* and *new new Earth*, where all those Things should be acknowledged to be God's Creatures, and Glory and Honour and Praise be given him for them; where *Jehovah* should be *King*, and not the *Heavens*, which they were called, to the Dishonour of God, by all the Earth, almost, when the *Psalmist* wrote: The *Psalmist* predicts this great Change by describing the new Heavens and
new

new Earth; when the Heavens should move and act, and the Earth be moved and acted upon, and the Produce of it grow and thrive to *Jehovah*, and not as then to the *Heavens*. Tell it out among the *Heathens*, that *Jehovah* is King; that it is he who made the World so strong it cannot be shaken, that he will judge the People righteously. Let the *Airs Irradiate* and the *Earth* revolve; let the *Sea* roar, and all that therein is; let the *Field* prosper, and all that is in it; then shall all the *Trees* of the *Wood*, thrive before (and so give the Attributes of Strength, Glory and Greatness to) *Jehovah* for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the *Earth*; he shall judge the *World* in Righteousness, and the *People* in his Truth; *Hos. 2. 19.* betroth it unto himself in Righteousness and in Judgment, and in Loving-kindness and in Mercies,—and in Truth. The *Trees* that stood by the *House* of *Baal* and waved their *Tops* to the *Heavens*, or sent forth their fragrant *Odours*, and gave their *Wine* and *Oil* to the *King* (*Molock*) now stand by the *House* of *Jehovah*, as his *Creatures*, and spread out their flourishing *Boughs* as a *Shelter* for his *Servants*, and pour out their *Strength* to him that gave it; and so by their *Situation*, *Beauty*, and *Thriving*, shew themselves to belong to him, who had all

Power in his Hands ; and not looking like the *blasted Trees of Baal* ; Trees can neither *clap their Hands* nor *rejoyce*, but the Trees of *Jehovah* might be full of Sap, and say all that the most beautiful Imagery can describe, without it. God had declared he would *bathe his Sword in the Heavens*, and *cover them with Darknes*, which would at once stop the Motion of the Earth, and make it a Defart Wilderness. Here, he promises to heal the Wound, and orders the Heavens to shine forth again, and the Earth to revolve, and the Produce of it to thrive and prosper *before*, as in the Presence of *Jehovah*, look at *Isaiab* 35. 1, 2. and it is evident, the Words translated *rejoice* and *sing*, have *natural* and *material* Ideas, being used to Plants *thriving, growing and blossoming* ; and that their doing so, was shewing *the Glory of the Lord, and the Excellency of our God*. The Glory (of the Trees) of Lebanon ; and חרר, *the Excellency of (the Groves on) Carmel and Sharon*, Am. 1. 2. &c. were to *wither*, but to *reflourish* (as in this *Psal.*) all the Trees of the Forest were *before Jehovah*. If we want proper Words in *English* to express the *natural* and *material* Ideas of עלו, רנן &c. when used to the thriving and flourishing of Plants, and the Effects of the Sap circulating in them

them, that is no Reason why such Words had not such Ideas fixed to them, as the Prophets *plainly* use them for.

—*The Joy and Gladness here poetically appropriated, by the Psalmist, to the Heavens and Earth are figurative Expressions.*

SHOULD not we have been told what they are *Figurative of* ! What *Imagery*, or *Beauty* there is in the Air's Laughing, and the Ground's Singing? Now if he will look into *H.* he will soon see the *Imagery*, the Scriptures present us with, in the *Heavens Shining*, the *Earth's revolving*, and *Trees being full of Sap, and flourishing &c.* These material Ideas are something to frame into an *Image* ; are a Ground to lay *expressive, affecting and beautiful Colours* upon. Your Friend takes away the Paint and the Canvas, and then bids the Painter draw his Picture ; and thinks to solve the *Nonsense* with calling it *Poetical*, and referring to the *Classicks* for Authority ; every *Figure* which is not drawn from something that *really exists*, is only pretended to be a *Figure* ; the Heavens never *laugh*, so you can't make a *Figure* of their Laughing. It is direct *Nonsense*. And now, Sir, I leave it to you, which Translation makes the best Sense ; and in short, whether the old Translation be *any Sense* at all.

WE

WE now pass on to the most *material Part* of the Objection, *viz. that of obtruding the Spiritual Sense, in Prejudice to the Material; and of reducing the literal Meaning into Allegory, Page 43.* — *Who would have looked for Figure or Allegory in this Chapter (Gen. 1.)*

Does your Friend take v. 26. in a figurative or a literal Sense? The *Image and Likeness* of God, that Man is created in, has always been construed in a *Spiritual Sense* by almost all Mankind, so almost all Mankind have looked for *Figure and Allegory* in this Chapter.

— *Wherein the sacred Historian relates the Transactions of the Almighty, during his six Day's Works, in the most plain and intelligible Terms,*

Plain and intelligible, as he may think the *Terms*, they were never made Sense of, since the Captivity of the *Jews*, by any one that we know of, except by *H.* It is not the *Apologist* with all his Teachers, can make either *Grammar, Sense, or Truth* of them; if he thinks he can let him try his Skill upon those few Difficulties I have started at the Beginning of this Letter. . But who makes an Allegory of it! What is your good Friend dreaming of! Here is no *Allegory*, but the literal Sense of the Words given

given. Just now he was blamed for etymologising these very Words, *i. e.* giving them the *natural Sense and precise Meaning* of the Roots they belong to; now an *Etymology* is an *Allegory*, a strange Creature this *H.* that the same thing in him should be both *Literal* and *Allegorical*. Your Friend runs himself out of Breath, and I was in great Pain for him till he got to the End of the Sentence, and seems to have been telling a Dream; *H.* makes the *Div* by their Substance fill all the Space in this System which the *solid Orbs* do not; extends their Kingdom and Power to beyond the fixed Stars; so makes them Lords over the Bodies of Men, Rulers and Orderers of all Things below, and by their being Representatives of the *Eternal Three*, makes them the Glass in which Man sees the *invisible God*, and so they feed his Mind also; and are not only standing Examples of Obedience to Men, but perpetual Instructors of us in the first Article of our Creed; and wherever their Mechanism was understood, a Trinity was always acknowledged, seen and understood; and will be so again where ever that Knowledge gains Ground: all this might be called *slighty* and *grand*, but should never have thought of its being censured as *Jejune* and *confined* and *Enervating*

vating the Meaning of *Moses*, and *Low* and *Insipid*: Either your Friend or I don't know what *Low* and *Confined* means. Nor is there the Shadow of Pretence to say, *H.* turns all into *Allegory*, and excludes the *literal* Sense. He must retain the *material* Sense, or he could not use that as the Glass in which we see the *Spiritual*. He must make the *Heavens* or *Air* really exist in *three Agents*, be Rulers in this System, be of the same Substance, three in one; or they could not be *Names*, *Representatives*, as he contends they are. The *Apologist* need not be afraid of the glorious Result of the six Day's Workmanship of the Almighty, being reduced to a Non-entity, the dark, unmeaning original Chaos. The Account has long lain as a Chaos, an unmeaning Jumble of Words, and it is not his unreasonable Fright about nothing, shall deter me from defending the Illustration of it. The glorious Account of the six Days Work, is such as you may now venture to tell *Free-thinking* and *Evil-disposed* Men, contains more Knowledge and Philosophy than all the Books, on that Subject wrote since; could the *Newtonians* have confuted his Notions of Philosophy, of a *Plenum*; the Air's performing all the Operations of Nature, &c. they had long ago done it.

YOUR Friend (p. 44.) gives another Instance in *ברית*, of H's turning the Historical Facts of Scripture into Figure and Allegory; H's Construction of *ברית* is, *he* or *that which purifies*; the Word is so used in the Scriptures, and it is not so much as pretended, that *ברית* is not regularly derived from *בר*; other Words being formed in the same Manner; your Friend says in the Note, that Lexicographers usually derive it from the two-fold Signification of its Radix *ברה*, *comedit, elegit*; the Lexicographers follow the Rabies in dividing the Hebrew Roots, and construing them; but it is not true to say they usually derive it from *ברה* *elegit, selegit, ab elegendo, quia eleguntur, &c.* "because People chuse, whom they shall agree with, and what they shall agree upon." Munster gives no Derivation of it at all, and Marius de Calassio derives it from *ברא*, to cut off: Nor can it come from *ברה*; the *ה* in *ברה*, to eat, is Radical, and it is a distinct Root from *בר*, or *ברר*, to cleanse, chuse, pick out; you never once find *ברה*, for pure or choice, except where the *ה* is Fæminine; many of the Roots are divided wrong in the Dictionaries, and this among others: Had *ברה* been the Root, the Noun would have been *בריה*; this your Friend knows, and his

M

Concor-

Derivation

Concordance will shew him several Instances of ברית, for the *Noun*, but not one of ברית; the only Place ברית occurs in, except where it is construed a *Covenant*, it signifies *some Cleanser*, and is by all the *Dictionaries* derived from בר. *Marius de Calassio* indeed doth not confound these two Roots, though many others do. Let us now see the Texts, where *Historical Facts* are turned into *Figure and Allegory* by this Derivation of Berith. Gen. 15. 18. God cut off a Purifier with Abraham, and 17. 2. I will give my Purifier between thee and me, &c. What is the *Allegory* here! Why this plain Fact, that God would send the Redeemer to purge him from his Sins; and that he should stand between God and Man, as one to avert the Divine Wrath, and transmit a Blessing to them; and as an Earnest of a Land of Eternal Rest, gives them Canaan, a Land of Rest here; and is not this as plain and clear as * cutting off a Covenant, or raising up a Covenant? but confirm it, making a Covenant what was that Covenant God made with Abraham? Why, a Promise, that in his Seed should all the Nations of the Earth be blest; that Christ should

* It is well known, that כרת is to cut off, and קום to stand, or cause to stand up.

should descend from him; and he himself receive the Blessing from one to descend from his Loins. *Abraham* knew Christ was to come, and what he was to do for him. He knew that Man, as *polluted*, was unfit to come into the Presence of God; and that the Design of Christ's coming, was, to do that for Man, which he could not do for himself, *viz.* make him clean, *pure*, and take off the Curse. The great Business of Christ, was to make the Atonement, and *Heb. 1. 3. purge our Sins by himself.* This was the *Covenant made before the Worlds*; and *Purification* is the Foundation, End, and Design of it; we were not, nor are Parties in this *Covenant*; nor have we any Hand or Share in the Performance of it. The *Covenant* was made before we were created; and the *Purification* or *Atonement* made by Christ, when we knew nothing of it. Man may be admitted by God, and was, and is so, into a Share of the Benefits, to partake of it on certain Conditions to be performed by him; as *Sacrifice*, which was a *descriptive Act* of the Manner; killing the Beast, shedding its Blood, and sprinkling and cleansing with it; and *Circumcision* was appointed as a *Memorial*, a constant standing Token that the Purifier should be *in their Flesh*; as he was

when *Jehovah* arose in *Dust*; and both the *Sacrifice* and *Circumcision* are called by the same Name, as the *Piēture* always bears the Name of what it is drawn for; and *Gen. 17. 10.* is, *This is* (the Sign or Token, or Memorial of) *my Purifier*, so *Circumcision* is explained in the very next Words; not the *Covenant* or *Fæderal Aēt*; but a *Token* or *Memorial*. *Moses* designed to inform us that God here enjoins *Circumcision*, to be a *Sign* of the *Purifier* whom God had appointed the *Mediator* betwixt himself and *Abraham*, and his Descendants; on Performance of which on their Part he promises on his Part, to raise up one in *their Flesh* to purify them. This is a plain, and true Account and easy to be understood; I am at a Loss for the Reason of your Friend's Assertion, that—if we translate the Word *ברית* *Purifier*, then the Words *לאות ברית*, for the Sign of the Purifier, must be restrained wholly to the Grace bestowed on God's Part.

DID they not then make that Sign in their *Flesh*? or does the Expression, *Sign of the Purifier*, imply they did not? What is meant by *restraining it wholly to the Grace bestowed on God's Part*? The Grace of God was given us in *Christ Jesus* before the Foundation of the World, and God here promises *Abraham*, that he should partake

of it; that the Conveyer of that Grace should arise in Flesh, and descend from him, and appoints a *Sign* or *Memorial* of such Promise, and *Abraham* makes the Sign on himself and all the Males of his Family, that he might be entitled to that *Grace*; and have besides, the high Honour of transmitting down the *Holy Seed*; Is the *Sign*, in this View, less a *Sign* than in any other? and was not each *circumcised* Person, בן ברית a Son of him, whom God has given, *Isai.* 42. 6. for ברית (nonsensically translated, *Covenant*) a *Purifier of the People*? and I think this last Text is an express Declaration of the *Old T.* that ברית is not *Covenant* but *Purifier*. To talk of Man's making a *Covenant* with God in any other Sense than Submission to the Terms set him; a Desire of being admitted to the Benefit of that *Atonement* which they agreed before the World was made, that one of themselves in Flesh, should make for Man, is *presumptuous* and against the Sense of Scripture, and the Nature of the Thing.—If it (*Circumcision*) was not designed to be a *Covenant between God and the Jews*, it is hard to guess, why it was enjoined, p. 45.

NOT at all, the Text says expressly, it was enjoined as a *Sign* or *Memorial* of him, who is the *Covenant* (if ברית must be translated

lated, Covenant) of God. It was a Sign, that God had made a Covenant for them, not that they had made one *with* him; but that they should enjoy the Benefit of it on doing so. But this and their other Rites were no more *what they are called* than a Picture of a Man, is the Man.

You will observe, that your Friend has been for two Pages, in 44, 45, aproving that *H.* turned the *Historical Fact* into *Figure and Allegory*, and rendered the noble and unaffected Simplicity of the sacred Historian, intricate and obscure, but now the Charge varies, Page 46. and it is a *pious Opinion*, a comfortable *Doctrine*, only *H.* has placed it on the Support of such *Arguments*, as cannot be defended; Christ is as much the Mediator of the Old T. as the new; *The Law was ordained by Angels in the Hand of the Mediator, and there is but one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself, a Ransom for all; and Abraham and his Descendants were Christians in Faith and Knowledge, as much as we are.* If this be certain; and the Words of Scripture by regular *Construction* do say it, is the *Rabies*, the Apostates not having said it, a sufficient Reason for any one to say, *the Scripture doth not give the least Countenance to this pious Opinion?*

WE are to examine in the next Place, *what Advantage will be gained to the Cause of Christianity, by explaining those Texts of the Mediation of the Son of God. The Appearances vouchsafed to Abraham and the Patriarchs are supposed, according to the avowed Tenets of the Jewish and Christian Churches, to be the Appearances, not of God the Father, but of God the Son.*

WHAT Jewish Church does he mean? the Apostate Jews who had renounced Christ! they have made many treacherous Concessions; or their Ancestors before Christ? if the Latter, we know not what was their *avowed Tenets*; the Opinion of a Man or two is not to be called the *avowed Tenets* of any Church: If the former, I say, as has been often said by many, and proved, that the Spirit of God had forsaken the *Jewes* and they were no ways capable or willing to instruct us in the *Hebrew Scriptures*, and *secondly*, that the *Fathers*, or primitive Christian Church, knew little or nothing of *Hebrew*, and what they did know, they had from those Apostates; he knows there were but two of them that pretended to any thing of *Hebrew*, and therefore what sounds great, *the avowed Tenets of the Jewish and Christian Churches*, is just nothing at all; H. has shewn, that
all

all the three Persons of the Trinity appeared to *Abraham* ; and one would think so, from the first Words, *Jehovah appeared to him, and he looked, and lo three Men stood by him.* They were each, *Jehovah*, or none of them, as you may see at large in *H.* so the avowed Tenet is false, that God the Father, did not appear ; but to the Conclusion of this Argument.

— And consequently furnishes us with an indisputable Argument for the Divinity of the second Person ; which *H's* Explanation of the foregoing Texts entirely overthrows ; since it supposes that the Divine Person who gave the Son to be a Purifier, between himself and Abraham, was God the Father.

— No really it doth not ; it supposes it to be *אלהים יחיה* who promised that one of themselves should arise in Flesh, and atone for our Sins, Ch. 17. v. 7. “ I will raise up my Purifier,—that I may be *אלהים* unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee.” So it is the *Aleim* who promise to raise up the Purifier. There is a long Chapter on this Word *ברית*, in *H's* *Trinity of the Gentiles*, which your Friend ought to have read, before he had undertaken to confute it. And now ^{to} give a direct Answer to the Question, How comes *ברית* ever to signify a Covenant ? I answer it never does. It is either
Purifier.

Purifier or *Purification*; and the *Exhibition* or *Sacrifice*, which was cutting off, in Type, this *Purifier*, was what they confirmed their Covenants by, because the Benefits of this great Mercy was the Consideration that bound them to observe their Contracts; and so *cutting off a Berith together*, often implies a Covenant made, though it don't express it.

THE Answer to p. 47, 48, and 49. on the Quere, *whether H's Translation of the Old T. may not sometimes contradict the Explanation given of those Texts by these Writers of the New*, may be given in few Words on the Authority of our Church, that the LXX. Translation, which they mostly followed, “ was not so found and perfect, “ but that it needed, in many Places Correction, and who had been so sufficient “ for this Work, as the Apostles and “ Apostolic Men, yet it seemed good to “ the Holy Ghost, and to them, to take “ that which they found, the same being “ for the greatest Part true and sufficient, “ rather than by making a new Translation “ in that new World, and green Age of “ the Church, to expose themselves to “ many Exceptions and Cavillations, as “ though they had made a Translation to “ serve their own Turn, and therefore bearing “ ing Witness to themselves, their Witness

N

“ was

“ was not to be regarded.” * So Sir, you see, we are under no Necessity to give Judgment against the Apostles, they must have given Judgment against themselves, had they *corrected* the Translations they followed; St. Stephen was in the Right to use *διαθήκη*, for *Berith*; and yet H. may be in the Right in translating it, *Purifier*, and this fine *Dilemma*, your Friend seems so pleased to have ~~thought~~ the *Editors* in, proves a Noose not strong enough to hold a Woodcock. The same Answer is sufficient for all that follows to the Middle of p. 49. they made the best they could of a faulty Translation, and *refer* us not to the LXX, but the *Original*, to *Moses and the Prophets*; all this has been canvased before, but your Friend starts up, like one just waked out of a Dream, he had been frightened in, and flourishes away upon battered Objections, without taking any Notice of what has been answered, and perhaps knows nothing of the Matter,

His Scheme hath not been thoroughly canvased and examined; and we know not what we are to trust to, when we admit it.

THEREFORE we will reject it at once, because it has not been *examined and canvased*; his Writings have been abroad long enough

* See the Preface to the *English Bible*.

enough, and publickly sold as other Books are; and why was *it* not *examined*? Why *Frights* pretended, and *Suspensions* and *Apprehensions* urged, as Reasons for discouraging the Republication of his Writings? shew any Thing *bad* or *false* in his Scheme, and that would be to the Purpose, but leave Megrimms and imaginary Frights to Children, they don't become Men.

THERE is another Thing, Sir, I should desire of your Friend, and that is, to give a *fair State* of the Case; and when he would answer *H*'s Construction of this or that Word, he would give us what he says in *his own Words*, and not misrepresent it, through Hurry or Ignorance, or for some other worse Reason; thus *H.* does not construe אלה to curse, or translate it, *the execrated*; his Words are, " in Man who
" who takes an Oath, it is to imprecate a
" conditional Malediction upon himself,
" if he perform not the Covenant. In *Yehovah*, or *Aleim*, it is a Condescension to
" the Capacities of Creatures; he or they
" call their own Attributes to witness, and
" cannot lie, nor can there any Evil come
" to them," * and all the Dictionaries I have, agree in this Sense of the *Word*, and say, as *Leigh* does in his *Critica Sacra*, an *Oath with Execration or Cursing*, and gives

N 3

this

this Reason for it, that an Oath implies a Curse, and is confirmed by it. Every Oath lays the Person who takes it under a conditional Execration; I appeal to the Common Sense of Mankind for the Truth of this; how then hath *H.* confounded *Cursing* and *Swearing*, * since *Swearing* necessarily implies a *Curse*? But it is not fair to say, he construes אלהים, *execrated*, he doth not construe it so; though he does translate אלוה so, Job 19. 26. but not אלהים. Is there no Difference betwixt a *Participle Passive*, and a *Noun Substantive*? Christ was *made the Curse for us*; Why then not translate אלוה in its obvious Sense, when applied to him? It says then just what the Apostle says, that Christ was made the Curse; and if the *Persons of the Trinity* have really bound themselves by Oath, where can be the Hurt, or what Reason can be assigned, why a *Name* which says so, should not be so construed? I know of one, and that is the *Apostates* have taught your Friend, that אלה, as a *Verb*, shall signify quite different from what it does as a *Noun*, and their Authority must not be disputed; I might add another, that some of these Constructions help to prove, that *Job*, and the *Jews*, &c. were Christians. The Scriptures often call the Oath of

* See the Note, Page 47.

of God, his אלה; the Places have been produced; however, a *Concordance* will soon direct you to them; so it is *unfair* likewise to say, that שבע, is always used when God is said to swear. Construe, your Friend says, *Psal. 97. 7. Let all the אלהים, execrated worship him, according to H's Meaning.*

You see, Sir, it is *not* according to H's Meaning, nor the Signification of the Word; and it is *shuffling*, to take such Methods to expose a Man; and it puts one under the Necessity of using Language one doth not chuse to use. I don't know what Business this Note about אלה, had in Page 47, but I shall pass from it to Page 50, where the Objection is urged more at large, having answered all between (except what he says about H's Plan of Divinity, being *new*, which I am sorry for) only leave this Question for him to reflect upon, that since אלהים is *plural* and אלה *singular*, whether he doth not himself give Judgment against the *Evangelists* who translate the one by the other; as well as translate both יהוה and אדוני by Κυριος.

The Query, whether the Principles on which H. lays his Evidence for the Christian Religion be safe and consonant to Scripture, arises from a Surmise, that the Reason given for the Etymology of אלהים, is neither safe nor consonant to Scripture. ARGU-

ARGUMENTS are much easier to be dealt with than *Suspensions* and *Surmises*; But how is this *Surmise* founded? Why,

First, it does not appear to me, says your Friend, from Scripture, that the Three Persons in the Godhead, did oblige themselves by Oath, to redeem Mankind; consequently, what is here asserted, is a bold and unwarrantable Conjecture.

AND this is all we have for the first Argument. *It does not appear to me; may I not take the Liberty of asking who me is, that what me sees should be the Standard for every Body else to see by? Where is the Consequence, it doth not appear to me,— therefore it is bold and unwarrantable?* The Pope might argue so, but the *English Clergy*, whose *Apologist* he pretends to be, disclaim all such dictatorial Authority. It has been made to appear from Scripture, and I refer to what has been wrote on the Subject.

Secondly, That the Idea or Notion it conveys, is unworthy the Majesty of God, for I ask, wherefore was such an Oath necessary?

SAINT Paul has told him, to give Mankind the strongest Assurance possible. It was for our Sakes, not their own, they swore to perform the Covenant.

Had the three Divine Persons intended to redeem Mankind, was any other Security requisite to oblige them? To

To oblige them ! Who talks of any Security requisite to oblige them ; or of the three Divine Persons exacting an Oath of one another ? This is all Surmise.

Security

—No, it is an impious Supposition.

IT is so indeed ; but the Supposition is his own. H. doth not give the least Hint that way ; nor does his Construction of *Aleim* require it. It only says, *Jehovah* made the Covenant of Grace, and swore they would put it into Execution ; and this the Scriptures assert over and over again. When the Almighty swore to *Abraham* and *David*, they only repeated their Oath ; that which they swore to them to perform, was, what they had fore-ordained before the Foundation of the World ; and the Oath was taken then for the same Reason it is repeated ; that all Mankind might be convinced of the Immutability of the Counsel of God, when it should be revealed to them, that God had interposed himself by an Oath that it should not fail : Did not the Oath to *Abraham* or *David* oblige God to the Performance of his Promise ? God swore to them, that he would redeem Mankind, not as if any Security was requisite to oblige him, but for the Reason above ; and in the same View, they swore at first to redeem Mankind. So it may be.

I

Thirdly,

Thirdly, clear to him, in what Sense the three Persons of the Godhead can be said to have obliged themselves by an Oath to redeem Mankind. Which he says it is not at present.

But let it be shewn in what Sense the Father and the Holy Ghost had obliged themselves by an Oath to redeem him; consistent with the other positive Declarations of Scripture, which ascribe the whole Work of Redemption to the Son alone; and with the now supposed Necessity of obliging themselves by an Oath for that Purpose.

I don't like this Paragraph on any Account. In the first Place, let it be shewn in what Sense the Father and Holy Ghost had obliged themselves by an Oath consistent with the now supposed Necessity of obliging themselves by an Oath, is not Sense. In the next Place; there was no Necessity on their Side, but on ours, that they should oblige themselves by an Oath; and I wish he would shew me, what he means, by shewing in what Sense they obliged themselves, consistent with the Necessity of obliging themselves; and where H. supposes there was a Necessity on their Side to oblige themselves by an Oath. But the Scriptures positively ascribe the whole Work of Redemption to the Son alone; ergo, the Father and Holy Ghost are not

in

obliging

in our sense, or did not swear to the Performance of the Covenant of Grace.

IF by *Redemption* your Friend means the *Atonement for Sin*, it is true, that Christ alone redeemed us from the Curse; if he means the *whole Counsel of God*, or *Covenant of Grace*, it is not true that the Scriptures ascribe the *whole Work* to the Son, for they ascribe our *Sanctification* to the Holy Ghost, which is Part of the Work of our *Redemption*, in the general Sense of the Phrase; and so is the Acceptance of an *Atonement* on the *Father's* Part. But why can't your Friend *state the Case fairly*, and confute H. from his own Words? Does he say any where, that the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost* swore to redeem us from, *i. e.* to make *Atonement* for our Sins? If not, why is he charged with it? I am sorry any Man can condescend so low; for make the *best* of this Argument, it is but a *Quibble* upon the Word *Redemption*.

Fourthly, That the *Redemption of Mankind by the Son*, was a *free, voluntary, and unconstrained Act*.

AND does his *freely* and *voluntarily* swearing to do it, make it otherwise? Is it one Jot the less an *Act of Grace and free Will*, because he gave us the greatest Assurance imaginable, he would do it?

—It is supposed his Sufferings were not an *Act of Necessity*, to which he had obliged himself by Oath, but an *Act of free Grace*, and free Will; since no Reward is due to the Observance of an Oath.

A Reward is due to the Observance of an Oath, at least for doing what the Party assures another by Oath he would do for him. Suppose the *Apologist* and I owed a Sum of Money we could not pay; and a Friend of ours out of pure Kindness, engages for us to pay the Debt at the Time appointed, and to quiet our Mind in the mean Time confirms his Promise by a solemn Oath; the Time comes; he pays the Debt, and we get a Discharge.—“ I don’t thank you Sir, cries I; you was obliged by
“ *Oath* to do it; it was an *Act of Necessity*,
“ *no Reward is due to the Observance of an*
“ *Oath.*” What would you not call me for arguing in this Manner? (I must borrow a Line or two out of the Apology for my own Use.—) “ But I forbear pushing
“ this Doctrine to all the *absurd* and *Anti-*
“ *scriptural* Consequences to which it is
“ liable; and believe you will spare me
“ the Trouble of saying any thing more on
“ this Head;” and I fancy, if your Friend had not said so much, it had been as well. The next two Pages, till he comes to conclude, is meer *invective*, an Endeavour to
I irritate

irritate our Betters against the Publication of *H's* Writings, because he expresses himself a little *too warmly in a Posthumous Work*, which it is likely he would have corrected, had he lived to have published it, but which the *Editor* I suppose *thought* he had no Right to alter ; I mean *who the Devil, &c.*

Again, " Whether your Brethren" &c.

THAT our Brethren, the Clergy, meaning some of them, *have propagated stupid poisonous Stuff* for Christianity, I heartily wish were a Scandal upon them ; and as for the Universities, where is the Hurt in wishing them able to construe the *Hebrew Scriptures* without going to the Apostate *Jews*, by which Means he apprehended they would soon see, and really so do I, the *Classicks, Newtonian Philosophy, Clark's Demonstration of the &c.*——, and the other Books about *natural Religion* (which are the chief Study of the Juniors in the Universities, at least were so in my Time) to be, the *Classicks*, meer Trumpery, in Comparison of the Scripture ; and the others, *stupid poisonous Stuff*.

LET your Friend look no further than the Beginning of this Letter, and if he can clear the Scriptures from what is there charged on it, *as now translated* ; he will

make it appear, that the *first principal Advantage* he says is, proposed by the *Publication of H's Works*, viz. *The clearing of the Scriptures from the apparent Repugnancy to the established Laws of Nature*, may in some some Sort be obtained without it. As to the *second*, *The giving an Idea of that otherwise incomprehensible, but absolutely necessary, Article of our Faith*, which he declares to be an *Attempt*, that deserves to be discouraged, the poor Man talks upon it, as if we were in a *Popish Country*, and *Credo quia impossibile*, were good Divinity.

The Church of England confesses, that this Doctrine is an Object of Faith, not of Sight.

AND do not the *Scripture and Church of England* both teach us, that it is not good for the Soul to be without Knowledge, that *Faith comes by Hearing*; and does not common Sense tell us, that no Man can believe, what he doth not understand? Can I affirm a Proposition to be true or false, the Terms of which I don't know the Meaning of? That *stupid, Self-contradicting Notion of Eternal Generation*, e. g. which some pretend to prove the Divinity of Christ by, and which came from an Apostate Jew; is it possible for any ~~any~~ Man to believe what is a Contradiction in Terms? *Co-eternal*, and yet *begotten*; one Person, the *Fountain and Origin* of the other two, one *begotten* by

by one, and the other *proceeding* from them *two*, and yet all Co-eternal and Co-equal. If I ask what is meant by *begetting* in this Case, am I not answered, that *begetting* doth not signify *begetting*? and if I ask then, what you mean by one Person's begetting another Person of the Godhead; I am answered, it is not to *be explained*; if so, if you do not know what you mean by it; then you can't be sure it is in Scripture: If you don't know what you mean, you can't say, I contradict your Meaning; you confess you have no Meaning in the Words you use; and if you had, you might explain it.

Faith is the Evidence of Things not seen.

IT is so; but it is not the *Evidence* of Things not understood, that is a Contradiction in Terms; that is not *evident* to me,—which my *Mind* doth not see, or which I don't understand; But I may and do believe what the Eye has not seen; and by the Help of borrowed Ideas see the *invisible Things of God* and believe them; but cannot see or believe them without. But if our Church was *contented* with believing it knew not what; or what it has no Idea of, as your Friend contends, with, looking on *Faith, as the Evidence of Things not understood*, why was the *Athanasian Creed* given to explain and ascertain, the Doctrine of the Trinity;

Trinity ; and if we can explain the Creed, and *demonstrate* what it says to be true ; where is the Hurt of it ?

I have now, Sir, gone through with the *Apology*, and examined every Thing which bears the *Form* or *Look* of an Objection. I have cited the *Gentleman* in his own Words, and hope, omitted nothing that was necessary to give my Reader a full View of the Argument, though I could suppose that this *Thing* of mine, should come into any Hands which that *learned* Performance should not. Upon the Whole, it appears to me, that the Author is in a *Mist*, and was heartily resolved, if possible, to throw the same Mist into the Eyes of others, in order to discourage the *Subscription*, and so hurt the *Printer*, who, I hear, is to have the Profit, and the *Editors* only their Trouble for their Pains ; being satisfied with the Reward that arises from a Conviction, that they are promoting *real useful* Knowledge ; the Cause of Christianity ; and the *real* Credit of the Clergy.

I must beg leave to propose it to your Consideration, and that of every other Clergyman, whether if there be a System of Philosophy in the Scripture, and thence Ideas be conveyed of the *invisible Things* of God (and nothing is opposed to this, but the Rules and Constructions of the Enemies
of

of Christianity) whether, he who shuts his Eyes against it, does not shut his Eyes against the *Word of God*? and they who endeavour to prejudice others against it, be not doing as *Elymas* did by the *Deputy*? and what an Aggravation is it for a Man to do this, who confesses he has not read the Author? *Examine*, and then give *Judgment*, whether the *Christian*, or the *Apostates* are in the right? Read what he has objected to a *Vacuum* and occult Qualities; see whether the Scriptures do assert a *Plenum* and ascribe Motion to the impulse of a Fluid, which penetrates the Pores of all other Bodies; and whose Power arises from a continual Circulation of its Substance to and from the Sun; compare this with *Experiments*, and then judge between the *Prophet* and the *Infidel*; and say which was most likely to give us a true Account of the *Works* of God, *Moses* or *Newton*. But to reject what is offered without Reading it; to condemn unseen, any Thing wrote to explain the Scripture, is unworthy the Character of a Clergyman, whose *Business* it is to keep the most watchful Eye this Way, and read every Thing good or bad on the Scriptures, which Study, by his Profession, ought to be his chief Employment. To suppose that our Superiors in the Church will reject *unseen*; and without *carefully* examining the Truth
of

of *H's* great Pretensions, either disregard without *exposing* them (since this cannot be an Affair of an *indifferent* Nature, and will either do a great deal of Good, or a great deal of Hurt) and to pretend to apologise for them on this Account, is a *bare-faced Insult* upon their *Judgment*, and *Character*; the greatest Reflection that can be cast upon them. I dare say, they will *examine*, and either publicly *espouse*, or publicly *oppose* *H's* Plan.

I TAKE it for granted, the Editors, who are in Expectation of Objections from Men of Character and Station will take no Notice of an anonymous Pamphlet, though it presume to call itself, their *Apology*, it not being to be supposed, that such Men will decline putting their Names to what they publish. No doubt, they have Objections of *Weight* and *Force*, or they would not have given it out they had; and if they have, will certainly publish them in their own good Time. In the mean Time I chuse to publish my Letter to you, Sir, as an *Answer* to the *Modest Apology*; which, I am apt to think will stand in Need of an *Apology*, notwithstanding your Friend's prudent Resolution, *not to say a Word in its Vindication.* 28 JY 58

I am, Sir,

with great Respect, &c.

E R R A T A.

The AUTHOR'S Absence from the *Press*,
it's hoped will excuse the following *Errata*,
though so numerous.

PAGE 2. l. 26. *for* your *r.* their; p. 3. l. 2. *for* sacred, *r.* Scripture; *ibid.* l. 23. *for* Rebuilding, *r.* the Building; p. 5. l. 18. *dele* up; p. 8. l. 3. *add*, of Heaven; p. 12. l. 7. *for* aspiring, *r.* inspired; p. 18. l. 28. *for* your, *r.* our; p. 22. l. 6. *for* the, *r.* this; p. 25. l. ult. *r.* If his——his Theology; p. 27. l. 1. *r.* imperceptible; *ibid.* ult. Respect. A; p. 31. l. 5. *for* lame, *r.* same; p. 37. l. 23. *r.* what we infer this; p. 42. l. 1. *r.* Angel; p. 43. l. 15. *r.* Sustainers; p. 45. l. 5. *r.* very good; p. 47. l. 26. *r.* may see; p. 50. l. 5. *for* says, *r.* sees; p. 52. l. 8. *for* Manus, *r.* Marius; *ibid.* 9. *for* in, *r.* on; p. 55. l. 23. *add*, The Words above; p. 60 l. 26. *dele* is; p. 61. l. 16. *for* nor, *r.* or; p. 62. l. 1. *r.* the whole Scripture, p. 63. l. 25. *for* שָׁק, *r.* מִשְׁ; *ibid.* l. 26. *for* שִׁקִּי, *r.* מִשְׁ; p. 65. l. 2. *for* the *r.* by; p. 67. l. 7. *r.* as they; p. 75. l. 14. *add*, of; p. 77. l. 2. *for* מִמִּי, *r.* מִמִּי; p. 80. l. ult. *for* in affirms, *r.* affirms in; p. 83. l. 13 *for* gives, *r.* give; p. 89. l. 2. *add*, of; p. 89. l. 19. *for* Determination, *r.* Derivation; *ibid.* 24. *for* prick out, *r.* pick out; p. 96. l. 18. *dele* the Comma; *ibid.* 28. *add* to; p. 109. l. 28. *r.* contends, with

